

R E P O R T

FROM THE

C O M M I T T E E

APPOINTED TO

EXAMINE THE PHYSICIANS

WHO HAVE ATTENDED

H I S M A J E S T Y

DURING HIS ILLNESS;

TOUCHING THE PRESENT STATE OF

H I S M A J E S T Y ' s H E A L T H .

Ordered to be printed by the Hon. House of Commons,
13th January, 1789.

Printed from the Copy published by Authority

M,DCC,LXXXIX.

REPORT OF THE

COMMISSIONER OF THE

LAND OFFICE

FOR THE YEAR 1894

AND THE YEAR 1895

AND THE YEAR 1896

AND THE YEAR 1897

AND THE YEAR 1898

AND THE YEAR 1899

AND THE YEAR 1900

AND THE YEAR 1901

AND THE YEAR 1902

AND THE YEAR 1903

AND THE YEAR 1904

R E P O R T.

The Committee appointed to examine the Physicians who have attended His Majesty during his Illness, touching the present State of His Majesty's Health; and to report such Examination forthwith to the House;

HA V E, pursuant to the Order of the House, proceeded to examine the said Physicians. They also proceeded to some length in examining, with respect to the situation in which Dr. JOHN WILLIS has attended his Majesty; and from such examination are of opinion, that he comes within the order of reference to this Committee: but as his examination might have greatly protracted their proceedings, and as they have reason to suppose Dr. Willis, senior, fully informed of every particular necessary to the object of their enquiry, which could be stated by Dr. John Willis, they have forborne to examine the latter, conceiving that it is of the utmost importance that their Report should not be any longer deferred.

The examination of the Physicians is as follows; and that part of it which relates to Dr. John Willis, is added at the end of this Report.

Mercurii, 7^o Die Januarii, 1789.

Sir LUCAS PEPYS *called in and examined.*

WHETHER, in his opinion, the state of his Majesty's health does, or does not, continue to be such as to render his Majesty incapable either of coming to Parliament, or of attending to public business?

It certainly continues such as to render him incapable either of coming to Parliament, or of attending to public business.

What hopes does Sir Lucas Pepys now entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

The hopes I now entertain are founded exactly upon the same grounds upon which they were when I formerly gave my opinion.

Can Sir Lucas Pepys now form any judgment, or probable conjecture, of the time that his Majesty's illness is likely to last?

I can neither form judgment or probable conjecture of the time that his Majesty's disease is likely to last.

Whether, in his Majesty's disorder, Sir Lucas Pepys sees any present signs of Convalescence?

On the 27th of December, in the evening, I saw his Majesty in such a calm, and approaching towards a rational state, I was in hopes, had it continued, signs of convalescence would soon have appeared; those good symptoms appeared only for an hour; since which I have seen no signs of approaching convalescence.

Are there any actual symptoms at present, which lead Sir Lucas Pepys to entertain more or less favourable hopes of his Majesty's recovery than he has hitherto had during his attendance?

I think his Majesty is more easily controuled, and therefore I should hope that he was advancing towards recovery, though no actual symptoms appear.

Whether it is not usual for persons in the situation of his Majesty, to become more easily controuled when they are put under the care of persons used to attend patients in that disorder?

Certainly:—But he is more easily controuled now than he was a fortnight ago, when under the same care.

Whether this does not happen often, independent of any advancement towards recovery?

As controul is the principal means used for recovery, I consider patients submitting to it more readily, as a mark of some sort of ground being got.

Does Sir Lucas Pepys consider the circumstance of his Majesty being more easily controuled, as being in itself such a clear symptom of the abatement of the disorder, as induces Sir Lucas Pepys, from that cause, to entertain stronger hopes of his Majesty's speedy recovery, than when Sir Lucas Pepys was last examined?

Not stronger hopes of his Majesty's speedy recovery, but hopes of his more speedy recovery.

Whether in Sir Lucas Pepys' judgment, management or medicine is the more operative cause of recovery in cases of this sort?

I think without both, patients are not so likely to recover, as under either; neither would have effect singly.

Does Sir Lucas Pepys think, that the persons who usually have the controul and management of persons in his Majesty's situation, are better or worse, judges of the true inference arising from the fact of quiet submission to such controul, than physicians who have not made this disorder their particular study?

I think they are better judges.

What

What is the degree of attendance of the physicians who are not constantly with his Majesty?

Either myself, Dr. Gilborne, or Dr. Reynolds, are at Kew, in rotation, from Four o'clock every day, till Eleven the next morning; at Ten o'clock every morning, either Sir George Baker or Dr. Warren comes to Kew, visits his Majesty, and consults with the physician who has remained there all night, and Dr. Willis, and usually remains there about an hour.

Whether there are any other medical persons that attend his Majesty?

Two surgeons and two apothecaries.

Whether accounts are not received from them respecting his Majesty's situation?

No regular account is given by them, but they are frequently asked.

Whether those surgeons and apothecaries, or any of them, are persons who have made this disorder their particular study, or who have usually had the controul and management of persons in his Majesty's situation?

I cannot say whether they have made this particular disorder their particular study.—I conclude they occasionally see patients in this disorder, though they may not have the controul and management of them.

Whether you think them capable of relating facts with accuracy and integrity?

I would trust the judgment and integrity of any of them.

Whether those surgeons and apothecaries have the same opportunity of observing the particular situation of his Majesty as Dr. Willis has?

Not the same opportunity as Dr. Willis has, but the same as any other of the three physicians have who attend in rotation.

Whether Dr. Willis is present with the King often, or for any considerable length of time, when some one of those surgeons and apothecaries is not present?

Very frequently, and for a considerable length of time, when none of them are present.

Are not some of them present at times in which Dr. Willis is not present?

Sometimes, but not often.

When Dr. Willis takes rest, who is it that attends the King?

A page, and one of Dr. Willis's men.

Do no physician or apothecary ever come in at such times?

There is a positive order that nobody shall go into his Majesty's room without Dr. Willis's leave.

Who gave that order?

I don't know—it is written up in the outer room.

Did you never ask who gave that order?

I never asked.

What do you mean by the easier subjection to controul?

I mean

I mean a slighter degree of intimidation.

Is the easier submission to controul, in your opinion, produced by actual abatements of the disorder, or do you only consider it as facilitating the management which may produce a cure?

I conceive it as an actual abatement of the disorder as far as that goes.

Whether persons who have been for any length of time under a degree of actual controul, do not, from that circumstance, more easily submit to controul, independent of any abatement of the disorder?

I think not, as I have seen patients under the strongest degree of coercion for months together, who have not been at the end of that period, more under controul than they were at first?

Whether you have not known patients who, after having been under coercion for some time, have become more manageable without any symptoms of recovery appearing?

Certainly without any symptoms of recovery, but not without symptoms of an abatement of the disorder.

Whether or no you have not known such symptoms of abatement in consequence of controul to have existed, without any recovery having followed?

Certainly.

Whether after his Majesty has been submissive to controul, as by you stated, he has not afterwards grown less manageable?

Certainly—but not less manageable than he was before coercion was used.

When was it last found necessary to use coercion?

The middle of last week, as far as I can speak from my own observation. I understand it has been used since.

Whether, before Dr. Willis came about the King, the same modes of coercion were used?

No.

Whether there is not a greater probability of recovery where symptoms of abatement of the disorder have appeared, than where the disorder has remained for the same time without such symptoms of Abatement?

The probability of recovery is always in proportion to the frequency and degree of abatement of the disorder, except in cases of a sudden recovery.

Does the majority of persons in his Majesty's situation, with its present symptoms and appearances, recover?

It is my opinion that they certainly do.

Whether you consider the chance of recovery in a person who has passed ten weeks without symptoms of convalescence, to be equal to that of a person who has passed only six weeks without any such symptoms?

I think the difference between six weeks and ten weeks perfectly immaterial in cases of this sort, the period is so short.

Do

Do you mean the majority of persons in general have recovered, or do you mean the majority of those who are about the same age as his Majesty?

I cannot speak from any observation of my own, nor do I know that any such observations have been made by others, whether the majority of persons afflicted with that disorder at that time of life do or do not recover.

Do you consider his Majesty's present chance of recovery (all the circumstances of his Majesty's case that have fallen within your observation being attended to) as being greater or less, than it was when you was last examined here, or as being equally good?

From the circumstances which I saw on the 27th of December, I think I can speak with more certainty, when I say that I conclude his Majesty will recover, than I did when I was last examined.

Was Dr. Willis present on the 27th of December, at the time you observed the circumstances you alluded to?

Only for a very few minutes, and those at the end of the time; but his son was there the whole Time.

Since Dr. Willis has attended his Majesty, whether either Dr. Willis or his Son has always been present, when you attended, during the whole time?

I have sometimes been with his Majesty alone, more commonly in the presence of Dr. Willis or his son.

Have you observed any difference in his Majesty when you have seen him alone, and when in the presence of Dr. Willis or his son?

Sometimes his Majesty is more irritable when either Dr. Willis or his son is present, and at other times the contrary.

Whether on the 27th of December his Majesty shewed any consciousness of the situation he then was, or had been in?

There was no consciousness shewn at that time of his then present situation; but he spoke of his having been delirious at Windsor, and was surprized on my telling him, that his delirium had continued above three Weeks.

Whether there has been any direct or indirect attempt made by any of the Physicians, at any time to controul or influence you with respect to the account to be given of his Majesty's situation?

Certainly not.

Have not symptoms of irritation in his Majesty's case been frequent since you was last examined here?

Very frequent.

Whether the means of coercion have not been more frequently resorted to since that period than before?

More frequently.

Whether you have consulted any eminent person conversant in those cases, and not attending on his Majesty, respecting his Majesty's disorder?

I have

I have spoken with Dr. Munro, who has seen more patients than any practitioner ever did see, upon the point only of the probability of his Majesty's recovery, but not with regard to medicine or treatment.

Whether Sir Lucas Pepys has not founded his opinion as well upon the reports of the two surgeons, and two apothecaries, and other persons, in attendance upon his Majesty, as upon his own observations?

I ground my opinion upon my own observation only.

How long before your last examination were the means of coercion at all resorted to?

I believe only once, if at all; I am not sure.

Do you then conceive the irritation to have been greater since that examination than it was before?

I do not consider that the irritation was greater; but the means of coercion were not in our hands till about the time of examination.

Had the irritation, previous to the time of the examination, in any manner subsided?

Not so much as it has since.

Whether, notwithstanding the symptoms of irritation in his Majesty's case has been frequent since Sir Lucas Pepys was examined here, notwithstanding the means of coercion have been more frequently resorted to since that time than before, Sir Lucas Pepys can speak with more certainty when he says that he concludes His Majesty will recover, than he did when he was last examined here?

Yes, I think I can.

Can you speak with greater certainty with respect to the time of his Majesty's recovery?

I can say nothing about time.

Withdrew.

THE REV. DR. FRANCIS WILLIS *called in and examined.*

WHETHER in your opinion, the state of his Majesty's health does, or does not, continue to be such as to render his Majesty incapable of either coming to Parliament, or attending to public business?

Certainly not capable.

What hopes does Dr. Willis now entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

Such hopes, that if a patient under the same indisposition was in my house, I should not have the least doubt of his recovery.

Can Dr. Willis now form any judgment, or probable conjecture, of the time that his Majesty's illness is likely to last?

Not

Not any ;—I could not fix upon any ;—I would not hazard an opinion of that kind.

Whether, in his Majesty's disorder, Dr. Willis sees any present signs of convalescence ?

About a fortnight ago his Majesty would take up books, and could not read a line of them ; he now will read several pages together, and make, in my opinion, very good remarks upon the subject : I think, in the main, his Majesty does every thing in a more rational way than he did, and somethings extremely rational.

How often has Dr. Willis found it necessary to use coercion to his Majesty, since he was last examined here ?

I cannot say ; but very often : Before that time, the occasions were continual, but in a different mode.

What period of time do you mean, when you say before that time ?

I believe I was five days before I used any particular coercive mode, but endeavoured to persuade and explain what method must be made use of, if there was not a ready compliance.

When did you first begin the mode of coercion ?

I really don't know the particular day.

Whether Dr. Willis keeps any diary of his proceedings ?

Not before the 7th or 8th day I was there, as I believe.

To what period did you refer when you said, before your last examination there had been continual occasions for coercion, though in a different mode ?

I believe it was so when I came, and for some time after ; and I understood from the Pages, it had been so a considerable time before.

Whether the King was in this state of irritation, requiring coercion, at or about the time you was examined here before ?

He was at times, not always.

Do you understand from information that, previous to that time, the occasions for coercion were without intermission ?

In all probability there must have been intermissions.

Whether the instances of coercion, in whatever mode, were more frequent from the time of his arrival to the time of his last examination, than they have been since ?

Certainly more frequent.

Whether, during the period in which you endeavoured to persuade and explain what particular mode of coercion must be made use of, and to the day of your examination, other modes of coercion were made use of, and more frequently, than after you had adopted the particular mode ?

Certainly.

Whether, at the time of your examination before the former Committee of the House of Commons, the particular mode of coercion now alluded to by you had been resorted to ?

I really don't know.

B

Whether,

Whether, if the irritation had in a great measure subsided in consequence of the ordinary modes of constraint used upon his Majesty, you would have thought it necessary to have resorted to the particular mode?

If I had been confident of succeeding as well without, certainly I should not have resorted to that mode, for many reasons.

Question repeated.

No; certainly not.

Whether means of a stronger coercion have not been used since your last examination than before?

Certainly a more firm coercion, but not so teizing to the patient, and therefore used.

Whether you can now inform the Committee, or can by to-morrow enable yourself to inform them, when, and how often, coercion has been used since your last examination?

I believe I could not; I will endeavour to do it, but I have no idea that I can.

When did you last use means of coercion to your patient?

Either Saturday or Sunday, I do not recollect which.

Whether there has been any direct, or indirect attempt made by any of the physicians, at any time, to controul or influence you with respect to the account to be given of his Majesty's situation?

I have once or twice refused to sign the certificate, thinking his Majesty was better than the certificate implied,

Do you mean that you did not sign?

I persisted in the refusal till it was altered, and then I did sign it; but latterly I have scarcely read it over, and did not mind whether it was exactly agreeable to my opinion or not, rather than have any words.

Did you, in the instances to which you refer, differ in opinion from all the other physicians attending?

The two physicians present I differed from; there are but two attending in the morning to sign it, except my son.

Do you mean that this was such a difference of opinion that frequently happens among medical men upon the state of the patient?

Very frequently; but more likely in this case, where the other two physicians have scarce seen a patient in this way for an hour together; and I have attended various patients in the same house, and known the effect of method and medicine every hour.

What means did you use to persuade the physicians to alter the account, and adopt your opinion?

That if I had a patient at home that had passed so many hours in such a state, I should conclude that patient was better.

Did Dr. Willis use any other means than arguments of that kind; did he hold out any idea of pleasing, or displeasing, considerable persons?

No; none at all.

Are you sure, that on Friday last, the 2d of January, you did not use such arguments?

I will

I will not be sure that I might not say the alteration that was sent down by a certain personage was not worth while disputing, and at the same time that I thought it nearer the truth; for Dr. Warren did hold out, that he should think no person better, till they were perfectly well, under such an indisposition. I asked the Doctor, if a person, so indisposed, should not say one sensible word in 24 hours, and the next 24 hours say but one word, that he would not say, if he was not indisposed, whether he would not think him better; and he told me—No.

When you answered the last question but one, had you in your memory the circumstance you have mentioned?

I had not; I do not know that I certainly did say it; but I thought it, and very likely might say it.

Whether those alterations, sent down by a certain personage, were, or were not, suggested by you?

They certainly were not; they were brought down by two ladies——The paper, as sent up, was concerted among the physicians then present; was carried up, I believe, by General Gordon, and was returned by the two ladies, I believe.

Do you recollect whether the alterations were made on the same paper on which the account was drawn up by the Doctors, or on different paper sent down?

As well as I remember, it was not altered at all; but proposed by the ladies to be altered. I believe the alterations were not adopted—I am not sure, but I think not. I believe the account went to St. James's in the same form.——I really do not charge my memory with it; it was not worth while for me to remember.

Whether the conversation you state to have passed between you and Dr. Warren, passed when you were alone or before witnesses?

Before those Ladies and the Physicians and one of the Surgeons, I do not remember which, and my own son.

Whether Dr. Willis does not conceive the account sent to St. James's to purport to contain the true and exact opinion of the physicians who sign it, upon the state of his Majesty's health?

Yes; as well as three can agree in opinion.

Do you mean to say, that you signed your name to any statement of the King's situation to which you do not agree?

It was not so favourable as I thought; I signed it, rather than have any dispute.

Then, in point of fact, have you signed accounts of the King's health, which in your own mind and conscience you did not believe to be correct?

I believe no three physicians ever writ a prescription for a patient that was exactly conformable to each of their wishes.

Whether you consider the account sent to St. James's as a prescription, or as a statement of facts?

As a statement of facts, as near as we could agree.

Do you mean to say, that it is usual for physicians to sign their names to statements of facts, which they are not sure are true and correct, for the sake of agreement?

I have been told, by the physicians here, that the opinion of one should give way to the other two; and that they were surprised I should hesitate about it.

Do you mean by the physicians now attending his Majesty?

Yes.

Name the physicians from whom you received that information?

Sir Lucas Pepys and Dr. Warren.

Are the Committee to understand that the public have been, in any measure, deceived by those accounts sent to St. James's, as far as the authority of Dr. Willis's name was concerned?

I have done my utmost to prevent their being deceived.

What do you mean by having done your utmost?

I argued with the physicians as much as I could for other words to be put in, but in vain.

Do you recollect whether the alteration, which you stated to Dr. Warren not to be worth disputing, was a material one?

If I had thought it worth disputing I should have thought it a material one.

Do you remember what the alteration was?

I cannot answer that, but it may be known.

Whether you have, at any time, made any complaint or protest to any person in authority about the King, or to any of His Majesty's Ministers, upon the subject of the accounts sent to St. James's, or given them information that such accounts were not to be depended upon as correct, as far as your name was concerned?

I do not remember any thing at all about it.

How many hours in a day is it usual for you to be in personal attendance on his Majesty?

I cannot tell—Four or six hours, perhaps, according as his Majesty is employed.

Who are the other medical persons that are usually in constant attendance on his Majesty?

No medical person sits up with his Majesty—one of the pages and one of my servants, are in the room with him; and in the Anti-Room, one of each, who change every two hours, if they find it convenient.

What is his Majesty's state this day?

I have not seen him since the morning: he had a very good night, and was yesterday better than ever I saw him, and was calm this morning.

Do you mean that there was a greater appearance of rational interval yesterday, than at any other time?

Yes.

Was there less irritation yesterday than before?

A great deal less—he read and attended to reading for an hour together.

Do

Do you now consider the irritation to have in a great measure subsided?

He is still extremely irritable.

Whether you wrote to the Prince of Wales, yesterday, any account of the King's state?

I believe I did on Monday.

Whether you do not consider the subsiding of the irritation, as a necessary prelude to symptoms of convalescence?

I do.——His Majesty is not now so irritable as he was, nor does the consequence of the irritability continue a tenth part so long—not nearly so irritable as at the time of my last examination.

Withdrew.

Dr. RICHARD WARREN, *called in and examined.*

WHETHER, in his opinion, the state of his Majesty's health does or does not, continue to be such as to render his Majesty incapable either of coming to Parliament, or of attending to public business?

Incapable.

What hopes does Dr. Warren now entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

My hopes of his Majesty's recovery stand upon the same foundation as they did when I was examined before, excepting that a little more time has passed, which does not add to my hopes, but is so little that it hardly ought to subtract from them.

Can Dr. Warren now form any judgment, or probable conjecture, of the time that his Majesty's illness is likely to last?

No.

Whether, in his Majesty's disorder, Dr. Warren sees any present signs of convalescence?

No.

Whether there has been any cessation of the King's disorder at any time since its commencement?

No, as far as I can judge. I visit his Majesty every other morning, converse with him as long as I think it necessary, and form a judgment of the then state of his Majesty from the knowledge which I obtain from conversing with him:—The rest of my knowledge of his Majesty's state is obtained from the information given by the physician who has attended from four o'clock in the afternoon till the time I get to Kew, and from Dr. Willis and his son, and from the information of Mr. Charles Hawkins, Mr. Keate, Mr. Dundas, and Mr. Battiscombe, one or other of whom are constantly in the house in attendance. From the knowledge thus acquired, and information thus obtained, I conclude that there has been no cessation of his Majesty's complaint.

Whether Dr. Warren thinks that the information he gathers from those gentlemen is material to the forming of his judgment?

These gentlemen have attended his Majesty from the beginning of his illness till this minute, were about him before he was ill, and are perfectly well acquainted with his Majesty, and are very intelligent

ligent persons :—From these circumstances I conclude that they are very competent judges how far his Majesty's present state deviates from his former.

Do you consider them as competent judges of the progress of his recovery ?

Yes.

Whether or not Dr. Warren has understood from Dr. Willis, or others, that his Majesty has been in a rational state ?

No.

Does Dr. Warren know, whether the majority of those who, at his Majesty's time of life, have been afflicted with the disorder his Majesty labours under, have recovered ?

I have been making an enquiry lately, in order to satisfy my own curiosity respecting this question ; and I believe it will be still two days before I can give a satisfactory answer.

Where are you making that enquiry ?

By examining the books of Bethlehem Hospital.

What circumstances, in your judgment, would constitute a cessation of his Majesty's complaint, as contra-distinguished from a cure ?

My rule of judging whether a person in his situation is recovering, is as follows :—If the patient recovers his reason, or becomes himself again, only for an hour, I pronounce that the complaint has ceased, and that he is mending ; if the next day, or any short time afterwards, the interval becomes two hours, I pronounce him better ; if the interval becomes longer and longer, I pronounce him advancing in his cure.

What circumstances, in Dr. Warren's judgment, form a cure ?

The patient remaining perfectly himself, without any return of his former complaint.

If the patient appeared to be perfectly himself for a smaller term than an hour, would Dr. Warren consider him in a state of amendment ?

Certainly I should, if the state of the patient during that time could be accurately ascertained.

Whether those circumstances, which in your judgment would form a cessation of his Majesty's complaint, ought to be considered, in your judgment, as signs of convalescence ?

Certainly.

Whether the gentlemen you have named, namely, the physicians, apothecaries, and surgeons, are persons who, in your judgment, have made this branch of physic, their particular study ?

I do not know that they have,

Withdrew.

Doctor WARREN called in again, and desires to add to his answer to the last question but two, these words—“ But if the interval does not increase, no stress must be laid upon it at all.”

If a patient in his Majesty's disorder did not soon recover under Doctor Warren's care (Doctor Warren receiving his information,

as

as to the facts of his patient's case, from gentlemen whom he did not know to have made this branch of medicine their particular study) would not Doctor Warren think it his duty to call in persons whom he did know to have made this branch of medicine their particular study?

No, not on that account. Doctor Warren, and all other physicians, are obliged to receive their accounts of facts from nurses, and other unscientific persons; and if they are people of common sense, they are able to give a very good account of facts; from the facts as related by them, the physician must form his judgment, assisted by the knowledge which he acquires by visiting and examining the patient himself.

Whether, in point of fact, where persons in the disorder under which his Majesty labours, have not soon recovered under Doctor Warren's sole care, he has not always, or generally, called in persons who made this branch of medicine their particular study?

Yes, if the patients could afford it.

Whether, in cases where the patients could afford it, Doctor Warren has not oftener left the patients to the care of persons who have made this branch of medicine their particular study, than he has attended in conjunction or consultation with such persons, if they have not soon recovered under his sole care?

Yes, oftener.

Whether, as Dr. Warren has answered the last question affirmatively, he has not been determined so to act, by a conviction that, where the circumstances of a patient would admit of that mode of treatment, that such mode of treatment was the best which his conscientious judgment could dictate?

This mode of treatment has often arisen from necessity, as it was requisite, for the good of the patient, that he should be removed to a distance from Town, where it was impossible for Doctor Warren to attend with regularity, consistent with his usual business: this removal was necessary for the sake of quiet and other conveniences, which the patient could not have in Town: sometimes from the necessity of coercion, which Doctor Warren has no means of applying; sometimes for the sake of particular nurses and keepers, which Dr. Warren does not furnish; and from that diffidence which Dr. Warren ought always to have in himself when his patients do not recover as soon as can reasonably be expected.

Has that diffidence led Dr. Warren to place patients, who have not soon recovered, under the care of persons who have made this branch of medicine their particular study?

Sometimes.

Does Dr. Warren mean to say, that persons who have made this branch of medicine their particular study, and who follow that branch of medicine principally, are not better judges of the disorder, but have only better conveniences for the management of

of persons labouring under it, than physicians who practise medicine generally, without particular application to this branch of it?

Provided their parts and intellectual powers are equal to their business, they will become more expert in the curing of this complaint than other physicians; otherwise they will deserve no preference but for the conveniences they provide for their patients.

Whether the same would not be the case with physicians who have not made that branch of medicine their particular study, if their parts and intellectual powers are not equal to their business?

Certainly.

Whether, if nine persons out of ten, placed under the care of a person who had made this branch of medicine his particular study, had recovered, if they were placed under his care within three months after they had begun to be afflicted with the disorder, Dr. Warren would not deem such person, either very skilful or very successful?

If he was a sensible man I should deem him skilful, if he was not, I should deem him successful.

Whether Dr. Warren has not understood from Sir Lucas Pepys, that since his former examination, he thinks his Majesty more likely to recover, than he did at the time of that examination?

There was one evening, less than a fortnight since, that Sir Lucas Pepys said, he observed that his Majesty talked more like a reasonable man, but this appearance was so totally gone a few hours afterwards, that I had no doubt of its being a misapprehension in Sir Lucas, arising from his zeal.

Has Dr. Warren any reason to believe, that Sir Lucas Pepys is still under what Dr. Warren calls a misapprehension in this respect.

I do not know what Sir Lucas now thinks of his opinion of that night; but his opinion yesterday, when we were together at Kew, was, that his Majesty was no better.

Has Dr. Warren communicated to Sir Lucas Pepys, his reasons for thinking the opinion of Sir Lucas Pepys a misapprehension?

I do not know whether I gave him any formal reasons on the subject, but I know that I expressed my doubts about it.

Whether Dr. Warren has not understood from Dr. Willis, that he was more confirmed lately, in his hopes of his Majesty's recovery, than he was at the time of his former examination before the committee?

Dr. Willis spoke very sanguinely of a speedy cure, soon after the time of his former examination; he has held the same language ever since, but spoke in stronger terms of amendment being actually obtained last week, than at any other time.

Has Dr. Warren ever heard from Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Keate, Mr. Dundas, and Mr. Battiscombe, that his Majesty is in a state of actual amendment as to intellect; and that the probability of his recovery

recovery is greater now than at the time Dr. Warren was last examined ?

No.

Has Dr. Warren understood, on the contrary, from any or all of these gentlemen, that his Majesty is not in an actual state of amendment as to intellect ; and that the probability of his recovery is not greater now than at the time Dr. Warren was last examined ?

From some of them I have heard that his Majesty is not in a state of amendment ; but I have not talked to them upon the probability of cure, my discourse with them being chiefly confined to facts.

Has Dr. Warren ever heard from any of these gentlemen, that there has at any time been any return of reason in his Majesty since the commencement of his disorder ?

No.

Has Dr. Warren known any instance of any physician, or other person attending on his Majesty, sending any written account of his Majesty's situation, stating his Majesty to have been in a calm and amended state, at a time when he (Dr. Warren) had reason to know that his Majesty's situation and state were the reverse ?

Dr. Willis has written letters to the Prince of Wales, expressing his Majesty to be much better than I apprehended his Majesty to be at that time, declaring progress in cure that I could not discover.

Has Dr. Warren had any discourse, or difference of opinion, with Dr. Willis, respecting any other letter, of the same description, to any other person ?

I was informed that Dr. Willis wrote such a letter, at twelve o'clock at night, the day of the debate in the House of Commons ; I spoke to Dr. Willis on the subject of this letter the next morning, and told him that he did wrong to write such an account, when it was not true : I afterwards enquired, and could not find that the Doctor had written such a letter, and told him that I had done him an injury in charging him with it, as I could not prove it.

Does Dr. Warren recollect to whom that letter was supposed to be written ?

The report was, that it was written to Mr. Pitt.

Does Dr. Warren recollect from whom he received that information ?

There was a report current throughout the town that Mr. Pitt had read such a letter at White's, at five o'clock in the morning.

Does Dr. Warren recollect only the current report, but not any particular person from whom he heard it ?

Indeed I cannot recollect any particular person.

Does Dr. Warren recollect what was stated to be the substance of that supposed letter ?

In general terms, that his Majesty was greatly better, and was likely to be speedily well.

Does Dr. Warren recollect in what terms he stated to Dr. Willis

his disapprobation of his writing such a letter, or the substance of them ?

That, as his Majesty was remarkably bad, and under coercion that night, he could consider it only as a political letter, which he thought wrong from a physician.

When did Dr. Warren tell Dr. Willis, that he had done him an injury in charging him with having written such a letter ?

To the best of my recollection, it was the next time of my going to Kew after I had charged him with writing it, which, if so, must have been the second day after the charge.

Had Dr. Warren then had an opportunity of seeing the original letters written to Mr. Pitt on the day of the debate to which he alluded, and on the following day ?

I had seen a letter, written, as I thought, by Dr. Willis's son, dated at half an hour after five in the afternoon of the day of the debate—I do not know whether I saw a letter written the day after or not. I believe I might have done so if I pleased.

Whether the letter which Dr. Warren did see, did contain a just description of his Majesty's situation, according to Dr. Warren's opinion ?

When I came to Kew the morning following, I was informed by Dr. Willis that his Majesty had had a violent paroxysm that night, which came on at seven o'clock the evening preceding, but how his Majesty exactly was at half an hour after five, I do not know.

Whether the letter, dated at half an hour after five, gave a favourable account of his Majesty ?

To the best of my recollection it contained a favourable account.

Whether Dr. Warren had any information given him of the time when this letter was received ?

I do not remember that I had.

Did Dr. Warren understand, from any of the other attendants on his Majesty, that his Majesty had been, in any part of that day, in a particular amended state ?

No.

Did Dr. Willis make any reply, when Dr. Warren told him he had done wrong to write such a letter, when it was not true ?

Dr. Willis, by his behaviour, appeared to me at that time to own it.

Why Dr. Warren thought it necessary to acknowledge afterwards to Dr. Willis that he had done him an injury ?

Because Dr. Willis complained that I had charged him with a act that was not true. I made all the enquiry I could to find out the truth, and discovered that a letter had been written at half an hour after five, but could not discover that a letter had been written at twelve at night, and consequently concluded that there had been an error with respect to the time ; and therefore that I had done him wrong in charging him with writing it at twelve, and took the first opportunity of retracting what I had said.

What enquiry did Dr. Warren make, in order to find out the truth ?

The Lord Chancellor informed me of Dr. Willis's complaint, and said he would write to Mr. Pitt for all the letters he had received from Dr. Willis on that day; Mr. Pitt sent them, and the Chancellor shewed them to me.

Did Dr. Warren see Mr. Pitt's answer to the Chancellor?

Yes.

Does Dr. Warren understand, upon recollection, that the circumstances which satisfied him that the letter had not been written as supposed, were produced in consequence of his enquiry, or of an enquiry made in his name, or in consequence of Dr. Willis's representation on his uneasiness upon what had passed with Dr. Warren?

I suppose the letters were produced in consequence of my wish to ascertain the truth.

When complaint was made to Dr. Warren, on the part of Dr. Willis, did Dr. Warren make any enquiry into the truth of the fact of those persons from whom he received the information that such fact existed?

The Chancellor said, the only way to find the truth, was to send to Mr. Pitt for the letters. I do not know of whom I received the information.

Whether Dr. Warren ever saw any paper, purporting to be a copy of this letter supposed to be written at twelve o'clock at night, and if he did, by whom the same was shewn to him?

I do not recollect that I ever saw a paper, purporting to be a copy of it.

Can Dr. Warren take upon himself to say, that he never did see any paper, purporting to be the copy of a letter supposed to be written at twelve o'clock at night?

No, I do not recollect that I did.

Did Dr. Warren ever hear any person, whose name he could mention, say that he had a copy of a letter supposed to be written by Dr. Willis to Mr. Pitt, at twelve o'clock that night?

No.

Dr. Warren having said, that a letter of Dr. Willis's to the Prince of Wales contained a more favourable account than he thought his Majesty's situation justified. Does Dr. Warren mean to say, that such letter contained a more favourable account than Dr. Willis believed to be true?

It is impossible for me to say what Dr. Willis believes.

Dr. Warren having said, that in a case where nine out of ten patients placed under the care of a physician, who has applied himself to a particular branch of medicine, within three months from the commencement of their disorder, have been cured, he should deem such physician skilful, if he was a sensible man, and if not, should think him only successful; whether, if such success had attended that physician's practice for twenty-eight years, he should ascribe it to good fortune only?

There is no other way of judging but by success; yet it does not follow, that that judgment is right; it can never be supposed, that an ignorant man has knowledge, or that a man who has no rule to go by can act systematically, be his success what it will.

Whether, in order to induce Dr. Warren to believe, that, for twenty-seven years, nine persons out of ten had been cured, he would not require some other evidence than the assertions of the man pretending to have performed such cures?

I certainly should.

Whether there has been any direct or indirect attempt made by any of the physicians, at any time, to controul or influence you with respect to the account to be given of his Majesty's situation?

Dr. Willis, on Friday last, made a very unwarrantable use of the name of a great person; I call it unwarrantable, because I cannot believe that he could have authority to use it to influence me, while the report to be sent to St. James's was composing.

Will Dr. Warren relate the circumstances of that transaction?

The report proposed to be sent was written thus:—"His Majesty passed yesterday quietly, has had a very good night, and is calm this morning." Dr. Willis desired that some expression might be made use of, indicating that his Majesty was advanced since the day before in his cure; I objected to this, because I had ample reason, from my conversation with his Majesty, and from the information which I had received from Mr. Charles Hawkins, to think the contrary true.—Dr. Willis then said, "a certain great person will not suffer it to go so, and it will fall upon you."

Are you sure you are correct in those words?

I believe I am; I took the words down as soon as I came home.—Dr. Reynolds was present when the words were spoken.—I made no observation to Dr. Willis on those words; but, after talking with him a little more on the subject of his Majesty, composed, together with Dr. Reynolds, the following report:—"His Majesty passed yesterday much in the same manner as he did the day before; has had a very good night; and is this morning as he was yesterday." Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Willis, and Dr. Warren, signed this report: it was sent up stairs, and was returned, with an order to change the words, "as he was yesterday," into "continues to mend."—Dr. Warren desired the honour of an audience; and, upon stating his reasons why no amendment had taken place, the words, "continues to mend," were given up; and the sentence, "is this morning in a comfortable way," was substituted in their place.

When Dr. Willis used these expressions, "a certain great person will not suffer it to go so, and it will fall upon you;" whether Dr. Warren understood those words to convey to him, that a perseverance in his opinion would draw upon him the displeasure of the great person alluded to?

It was clear that Dr. Willis meant I should think so.

Whether

Whether the fear of the displeasure of that great person would, or would not, be a powerful motive of action with Dr. Warren, in any case where his conscience and honour did not prevent him paying attention to such a motive ?

It most certainly would.

Were the words Dr. Warren stated to have been given up, immediately after his stating his objections ?

After I had stated my objections, and supported them with several arguments, the words were given up ; and upon my saying, " That though his Majesty was not mended since yesterday, yet that he was in a comfortable way this morning, which I hoped tended to a cure," the word " comfortable" was immediately adopted.

Whether, upon Dr. Warren's stating that he objected to those words, they were immediately given up ? or, Whether there was any inclination shewn to induce Dr. Warren to sign the altered report, after he had stated that he objected to the alteration ?

There was no inclination shewn to give up the words, till the word " comfortable" had been used.

Question repeated.

After my arguments had been repeated, and seemed to be understood, and I had added, that I had received information from one of his Majesty's attendants, of the state of his Majesty's health that morning, the words were given up.

Whether there was any period, after the witness had declared that he objected to the alteration, in which an inclination was shewn to induce him to sign it ?

Till I was completely understood.

Does the witness mean, by being completely understood, till it was understood that he objected, or till the arguments upon which he founded his objections were completely understood ?

Till the arguments upon which I founded my objections were completely understood.

Is the committee to understand, then, that, during that period in which it was understood that Dr. Warren objected, but the arguments upon which he objected were not understood, an inclination was still shewn to induce him to sign the altered report ?

The great person seemed to be so strongly persuaded that there was a real amendment that morning, that it was necessary to produce several arguments to convince that person of the contrary ; until that conviction was obtained, there appeared an expectation that I should adopt the words " continues to mend."

Is the committee to understand, that that expectation continued to appear after Dr. Warren had stated, that he objected to the alteration ?

In the interval after stating that I objected, and before the arguments had been stated, that expectation appeared to continue.

Whether

Whether Dr. Warren did, or did not, peremptorily refuse to sign the altered report?

No;—that great person adopted the word “comfortable,” and I immediately retired to put it into the report.

Whether subsequently to this audience, any thing passed relative to this transaction?

Yes;—Lady Harcourt, and Lady Charlotte Finch followed me down stairs, and inquired of me, who the person was from whom I had my information relative to his Majesty’s health that morning? I answered, from Mr. Charles Hawkins. When Mr. Charles Hawkins appeared, he was asked by the two ladies what he had said to me that morning respecting his Majesty’s health? He gave them an account, and they retired. The next time that I went down to Kew I was treated with marks of attention and respect that I had not received for some time before.

What was the line of argument employed by Dr. Warren, in order to convince the great person of whom he has spoken, that in the King’s situation that morning, there was no real amendment?

First of all I mentioned the rule by which I judged of the health of persons in his Majesty’s situation, and which I have given in the former part of this examination, I then drew an argument from the conversation I had had with his Majesty, without mentioning the particulars of it. I then observed his Majesty had often been in the same state without its remaining many hours (which turned out to be the case on that day). I then brought another argument from the information I had received from Mr. Hawkins.

Withdrew.

Jovis 8^o. Die Januarii, 1789.

Sir LUCAS PEPYS *again called in and examined*

DID Sir Lucas Pepys ever endeavour to induce Dr. Willis to sign any report sent to St. James’s respecting the King’s health, which report Dr. Willis affirmed to be contrary to the true state of the King’s situation?

The only conversation which appeared at all like altercation, respecting the account sent to St. James’s, was, whether the words “very good night,” instead of “good night” should be put in.

Did you ever tell Dr. Willis that it was usual for physicians to sign their names to statements of facts, which they are not sure are true and correct, for the sake of agreement?

Certainly

Certainly never ;—but upon such trifles as above mentioned, I stated, that it was the usual custom, when two out of three were of the same opinion, for the third to acquiesce.

Does Sir Lucas Pepys mean, that that opinion of his was confined to such trifles as related to the wording of nearly the same opinion ?

At that time it related merely to those words ; and though I understand differences of opinion have arisen about wording the account sent to St. James's, yet when I have been present none have arisen.

Did Sir Lucas Pepys ever inform Dr. Willis, that the opinion or medical judgment, connected with any statement of fact of one physician, should give way to the other two, and that he was surprized that Dr. Willis should hesitate about it ?

Unless the word "very" above mentioned, may be considered as connected with a medical fact, I know of no other conversation upon the subject.

Did Sir Lucas Pepys on that occasion, employ any vehement persuasion, so as to bring on words or altercation with Dr. Willis so as to induce Dr. Willis to sign such reports against his judgment, in order to avoid such altercation ?

I was writing during the whole time ; and so far from using vehement words, I advised him, in the quietest manner, to avoid all altercation about trifles ; and though Sir George Baker and I were two opinions against one, finding Dr. Willis was anxious to retain the word "very," Sir George Baker gave up the point, and the report went as Dr. Willis had desired it.

Whether Sir Lucas Pepys does not hold himself responsible in his character to the public for the truth of the report sent to St. James's to which he signs his name ?

Certainly not for the whole truth ; as we considered it as unnecessary to wound the feelings of her Majesty and the rest of the family, by saying more than was absolutely necessary.

Whether you do not hold yourself bound to set your name to no account which contains any thing which you think not true ? I certainly do.

Whether if Sir Lucas Pepys happened to be of opinion, upon any morning, that the words "continues to mend," would be an apt description of his Majesty's case, and Dr. Warren and Sir George Baker should think the words "his Majesty is in a comfortable way," more proper, intimating at the same time, that they hoped that that had a tendency to a cure, Sir Lucas Pepys would think he acted unwarrantably in giving up the words, "continues to mend," and agreeing to the words used by the other two physicians, namely, "his Majesty is in a comfortable way," those words being so explained as to their tendency ?

It

It is impossible that those words, " comfortable way," and " continues to mend," could have the same tendency, and be of the same import.

Whether, if Dr. Warren had used those words, " his Majesty is in a comfortable way this morning, which I hope tends to a cure," Sir Lucas Pepys would have thought he acted unwarrantably in using those words in conjunction with the other physicians so explaining in fact their sense of them.

I should have thought I had acted unwarrantably in signing my name to such an explanation, which could never be an explanation of " continues to mend."

Was Sir Lucas Pepys of opinion, the day before yesterday, that he ought to have no better hopes of his Majesty's recovery than he had when he was formerly examined here?

I stated yesterday, that the hopes of recovery must be still on the same ground upon which I had stated them to be at the former examination; for, though I saw occasionally abatement of symptoms, I saw no symptoms of approaching convalescence.

Does Sir Lucas Pepys continue to think this morning as he did yesterday, that all the circumstances of his Majesty's case being duly attended to, he can conclude with more certainty that his Majesty will recover, than he could when he was examined before the former committee?

Though the hopes of recovery must have been the same yet from the consideration of the abatement of symptoms, I continue in the opinion that I was yesterday, that I can speak with more certainty of the prospect of his Majesty's recovery.

Whether, if there has been any error or imperfection in the accounts sent to St. James's, Sir Lucas Pepys conceives it to have consisted in representing his Majesty's state to be worse than it is?

Directly the contrary.—I have always endeavoured to represent his Majesty's situation in the most favourable light.

Whether Sir Lucas Pepys considers it to be his duty to take care, as far as depends on him, that the report sent to St. James's shall convey such an account as may not tend to mislead the public, respecting the state of his Majesty's health?

Till after the examination before the Privy Council, every account was purposely framed, to give the public no sort of information of his Majesty's situation. Since that period we have endeavoured as much as possible, to represent his Majesty's situation as favourably as possible, consistent with truth, though without mentioning particular circumstances.

Whether under any explanation of the words, " continues to mend," Sir Lucas Pepys would think himself warranted to sign a report containing those words, if he was not convinced either by his own observation, or the information of others, that there

there had been previous signs of amendment as leading to convalescence?

Nothing could induce me to sign the words "continues to mend," unless I had from my own observation discovered evident signs of gradual approaches to convalescence, under any explanation whatsoever.

When Sir Lucas Pepys said there was an endeavour to represent the King's situation in a favourable light, did he speak of the reports signed by the other physicians, or more particularly of those signed by himself.

I am satisfied, from repeated conversations on the subject, that the rest of the physicians concurred with me in always endeavouring to give the most favourable account.

Whether you know when the order mentioned by you yesterday, that no person should be admitted without the leave of Dr. Willis, was first made?

I cannot justly say whether it was five, six, or seven days ago, but somewhere thereabouts. As far as I can recollect, it must have been on Friday last—I never saw it till I was down the time before last—it was when I came down at four o'clock on Friday.

Do you recollect the terms of the order?

The purport of it is, that it is ordered that no person shall go into his Majesty's apartment, without the leave of one of the Doctor Willis's.

Whether to your knowledge, any improper persons either by means of the physicians, or of others, had obtained admission into his Majesty's apartment, to make the issuing such an order necessary?

I know of no person having been admitted into his Majesty's apartment, except those who are in usual attendance upon him, unless Dr. Willis's son, the clergyman, may be considered as such.

Is that son a physician?

No.

Whether you have not observed that patients under this malady may enjoy a state of considerable bodily health, the free use of all their bodily organs, and of all the bodily functions, and yet still labour under a mental distemper?

Undoubtedly.

Whether in this malady there may not be a temporary and partial use of understanding, when at the same time, the general mental faculties continue much deranged?

Certainly.

Whether or no the persons who are used to the discipline employed in this malady, and to the means of coercion, are not known to obtain a considerable dominion over the persons under their care?

Certainly.

D

Whether

Whether you have not observed, that the favourable circumstances which occur in one day, have frequently been overturned in the next?

Continually.

Withdrew.

SIR GEORGE BAKER *called in and examined.*

Whether, in his opinion, the state of his Majesty's health does, or does not, continue to be such as to render his Majesty incapable, either of coming to Parliament, or of attending to public business?

Certainly.

What hopes does Sir George Baker now entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

My hopes of his Majesty's recovery stand upon the same grounds they did when I was here last.

Can Sir George Baker now form any judgment, or probable conjecture, of the time that his Majesty's disease is likely to last?

I can form no judgment, or probable conjecture, with respect to the continuance of the disease.

Whether, in his Majesty's disorder, Sir George Baker sees any present signs of convalescence?

None.

Can you inform the committee, whether a majority of persons, who have been afflicted with this malady at his Majesty's time of life, have recovered?

I can only answer that by conjecture; I believe not.

Does Sir George Baker (all the circumstances of his Majesty's case, which have fallen within his observation, being duly attended to) think the chance of his Majesty's recovery greater, or less, than it was at the time he was examined before the former committee, or equal to what it was in his judgment, at that time?

In my judgment it is precisely the same.

Whether you consider the continuation of the malady four weeks longer, without any signs of convalescence, as making any difference with respect to the chance of recovery?

My experience leads me to answer, that it makes no difference.

Do you not hold yourself responsible in your character to the public for the truth of the reports sent to St. James's, to which you sign your name?

I have never signed my name to any thing that I had not thought true, or very near true: we have always taken it in the most favourable light.

Would any argument or motive have induced you to sign your name to a less favourable account of his Majesty's situation than, in your own conviction and conscience, you thought the fact was?

Certainly not.

Did

Did you ever endeavour to induce Dr. Willis to sign any account of his Majesty's health, which he (Dr. Willis) declared not to be correct, or sufficiently favourable, according to Dr. Willis's opinion?

Never.

Did Sir George Baker ever inform Dr. Willis that it was usual for physicians to sign their names to statements of facts, which they were not sure were true and correct, for the sake of argument?

Never.—I suppose I know what that alludes to.

To what does that allude?

It alludes to this:—one morning, when the report was to be sent to St. James's, his Majesty was reported to have slept four or five hours, I think—Dr. Willis insisted that the report should run, "his Majesty has had a very good night." Sir Lucas Pepys, who was there, and myself, said that we were very willing to say it was a good night.—Dr. Willis peremptorily insisted that it should be written "A very good night;" otherwise he would not sign it. I said to Dr. Willis, upon that occasion, I never knew an instance, before the present, when, in matters of no importance, one physician did not yield to two; however, I will have no dispute with you, I will allow it to be a very good night.

Then you confine your opinion, that one physician should yield to two in matters of little or no importance?

I do.

On whose report and authority did you form your judgment, with respect to the manner in which his Majesty had passed the night?

On the report and authority of the pages, the medical attendant, and Dr. Willis.

Whether Sir George Baker does not conceive, that if the fact of the manner in which his Majesty passed that night was disputed, the medical attendant, and others, from whom Sir George Baker received his information, would be the persons who could give the most correct account of that fact to this committee?

Certainly.

Do you recollect whether the medical attendant, or other persons attending, or any of them, said that his Majesty did pass a very good night?

I really cannot recollect—there is so little difference between a good night, and a very good night, that I did not think it worth charging my memory.

Sir George Baker then cannot say, upon recollection, that they did not say that his Majesty had passed a very good night?

I do recollect that Dr. Willis's son did state, that it was a very good night; as to the others, I cannot recollect.

Did Dr. Willis's son sit up with his Majesty?

I really do not know.

Is it usual for his Majesty to be attended by Dr. Willis's son through the night?

No.

Does Sir George Baker conceive, if the medical attendant, and the other persons whom Sir George Baker understood actually to have attended his Majesty through the night, had reported to him, that his Majesty had had a very good night, that he should have hesitated to have so stated it in the account?

I must observe, that the medical attendants do not sit up with his Majesty, so that our report depends upon the pages and Dr. Willis's men.

Whether the medical attendants are persons who could give the most correct information to this committee, of the fact how his Majesty passed the night?

Certainly,——if the medical attendant did not sit up, he could not.

Whether you do not think that those four medical attendants on his Majesty are capable of giving information respecting his Majesty's situation, worthy the attention of this committee, in addition to the information they receive from his Majesty's physicians?

The four medical attendants are very sensible men; each of them stays in the house twenty-four hours in his turn; and I think each of them capable of giving this committee satisfaction with respect to any questions they may ask.

Whether those gentlemen have not frequent access to his Majesty when the physicians are not present?

They have.

Whether they do not examine into the state and manner in which his Majesty passed the night, previous to the arrival of the physicians?

They used to do so till lately.

How long have they ceased to do so, and upon what account?

I think it was last Saturday morning, that I saw a paper stuck up over the chimney of the pages room, with an order to this effect; "No one, except the pages, is allowed to go to his Majesty, except introduced by one of the two Dr. Willis's."

When was you at Kew before that time?

That must be Thursday.

Was the paper not there then?

I did not see or hear of it.

Does Sir George Baker conceive that he must have heard of it, if any such order had been then issued?

I conceive that I must have heard of it.

Does Sir George Baker know of any instances of improper persons having been introduced to his Majesty's apartment, either

either by the physicians or others, to cause the issuing of that order?

No.

By whose authority was that order issued?

I asked Dr. Willis; he said that he wrote it, without any further answer.

Did Sir George Baker converse with any of the medical attendants respecting that order, or understand from them that they were excluded by it from entering, as they were used to do, his Majesty's apartment, unless with the permission of Dr. Willis or his son?

It was generally understood by the physicians that the order was intended to exclude them and the medical attendants, unless introduced by Dr. Willis or his son.

Did Sir George Baker hear, either from the physicians, or from any of the medical attendants, any reason assigned, as the probable cause of that order?

No.

Was Sir George Baker at Kew, on the Friday before that Saturday?

No.

If there has been any error or imperfection in the account sent to St. James's, does Sir George Baker conceive it to have consisted in representing his Majesty's situation worse than it is?

If there has been any error or imperfection, it has been in representing his Majesty's state better than it is.

Is it usual, when a patient is put under the care of a person who has made this particular branch his study, for that person to be consulted respecting the persons, by whom the patient is to be seen, or attended, and the time?

When I attend a patient with Dr. Munro, he and I consult and settle the times of attendance—the apothecary goes in without his leave—and there is a certain attendant or two always with the patient.

Whether the physicians, or some of them, since this order was made, have daily seen his Majesty?

Always with Doctor Willis.

Whether, previous to the issuing of that order, and since Dr. Willis has been attending his Majesty, Sir George Baker has not had frequent opportunities of seeing and conversing with his Majesty, not in the presence of Dr. Willis or his son?

When his Majesty first came from Windsor to Kew, I conceived that I was at liberty to visit his Majesty at any time, but afterwards I found it was disagreeable to Dr. Willis that I should go in without him, and therefore I have of late very seldom, if ever, visited his Majesty but in company with Dr. Willis.

Whether

Whether Sir George Baker thinks he can form as accurate a judgment of the actual state of his Majesty, from conversing with his Majesty in the presence of Dr. Willis or his son, as when allowed to converse with his Majesty as he had used to do?

In my opinion, it makes very little difference.

Whether, by Dr. Willis's advice, a course of medicine has been prescribed to the King, different from that which had been previously used, or would have been otherwise recommended by his Majesty's physicians?

No medicine has been given the King, since Dr. Willis's arrival, but with the consent of the other physicians.

Question repeated.

I believe there was one pill of calomel given to the King by Dr. Willis's desire, but I know of no other.

Whether that had the desired effect in promoting his Majesty's convalescence?

It had the common effect of purges, and no other.

Whether before Dr. Willis's arrival, the peculiar mode of coercion and management, which has been since used, had been employed in the same way, or in an equal degree?

Neither in the same way, nor in an equal degree.

Have they produced that effect towards the King's convalescence, which was not experienced from the former management?

They have made his Majesty quieter, more manageable; but I am not sure that any thing has been done by them towards convalescence.

Is Sir George Baker sure, that it was on Saturday the 3d instant, that he first saw the order that no person should be admitted into the King's apartment, without the leave of Dr. Willis, or his son?

It is a thing I would not take my oath to, but I believe it to be so.

Did you then hear that any dispute, or material difference of opinion, had taken place on the preceding day, between Dr. Willis and Dr. Warren?

I had heard it before I saw the paper, and that it happened on the Friday.

Did you understand that it was upon the information received from some of the medical attendants, who had then access to his Majesty's apartment, that Dr. Warren had in some measure supported the opinion he maintained?

I certainly did.

Do you recollect that Mr. Charles Hawkins's authority had been quoted by Dr. Warren on that occasion?

I heard that it had been quoted.

Does Sir George Baker conceive, that Dr. Warren, or himself, or any other physician attending his Majesty, would now be deprived

deprived of the same means of information, respecting his Majesty in their absence, upon which Dr. Warren then formed, in part, his judgment, unless with the permission or consent of Dr. Willis or his son?

If that order, set up by Dr. Willis, takes place, it will not be in the power of any of those medical gentlemen to give us any information.

How long have you been employed as physician to his Majesty?

Ever since the death of Sir Richard Jebb.—About a year and a half, I think.

Has Sir George Baker attended his Majesty only, or has he been employed in attending the Royal Family?

Both his Majesty and all the Royal Family: I mean the family at Windsor, and at Kew.

Is Sir George Baker now employed to attend on the Royal Family?

Only the King—not the Royal Family.

Whether there has been any direct or indirect attempt made, by any of the physicians, at any time, to controul or influence you with respect to the account to be given of his Majesty's situation?

None.

Dr. HENRY REVELL REYNOLDS *called in and examined.*

Whether, in his opinion, the state of his Majesty's health does, or does not, continue to be such as to render his Majesty incapable of either coming to Parliament, or of attending to public business?

It does render him incapable, unquestionably.

What hopes does Dr. Reynolds now entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

I think there are the same hopes now that there were before, not less, certainly.

Can Dr. Reynolds now form any judgment, or probable conjecture, of the time that his Majesty's illness is likely to last?

No, I cannot.

Whether in his Majesty's disorder, Dr. Reynolds sees any present signs of convalescence?

His Majesty is more quiet, more observant of the admonition of his medical attendants, in perhaps a still better state of general health, which are favourable circumstances, and which, I hope, lead to amendment; but I cannot say that there is any actual amendment at present in his Majesty's principal complaint.

Whether, in Dr. Reynolds's judgment, the chance of his Majesty's recovery (all circumstances that have fallen within his observation being duly attended to) is greater, or less, than it was

at

at the time Dr. Reynolds was examined before the former committee? or whether, in his judgment, the chance of his Majesty's recovery is as good as it then was?

The chance of his Majesty's recovery is certainly as good now as it was then, in my opinion.

Does Dr. Reynolds conceive that the duration of his Majesty's illness up to this time (all circumstances of his Majesty's case being duly attended to) does, or does not decrease the chance of his Majesty's recovery?

The duration hitherto certainly does not militate against his Majesty's recovery; few recover so soon from such maladies.

Whether, from Dr. Reynolds's observation, his Majesty does, or does not, appear to be more easily controuled now than he was a fortnight ago, under the same species of care and management?

I think his Majesty is more easily controuled.

In the judgment of Dr. Reynolds, and according to his observations in cases of this kind, is the circumstance that a patient is more easily controuled, a favourable circumstance towards his recovery?

It is frequently a previous step to it.

Whether it is usual, in cases such as his Majesty's, for physicians, who have not made such cases their particular study, to call in the assistance of physicians, who have made those cases the subject of their particular attention?

That depends very much upon the particular circumstances of the patient in many respects; in the first place, the pecuniary circumstances of the patient influence you in proposing a consultation with another physician: In the next place it will depend upon the symptoms of the particular patient; if no restraint or coercion is necessary, from the particular circumstances of the case, every physician of experience will, I have no doubt, think himself competent to conduct a patient in such a case; I mean at the same time to be understood, that in that case, as in every other, no liberal man will have any objection to a consultation, if called for.

If, in this disorder, restraint and coercion does become necessary, whether physicians of general practice do not usually call in the assistance of physicians who have made this branch of medicine their particular study?

It is usual, and for these reasons amongst others—that gentlemen who have dedicated themselves to that particular object of practice, have usually houses of reception for patients so circumstanced, which they superintend; from them, therefore, proper assistance can be procured; and, as it is necessary to avoid all causes of emotion in such patients, it may be proper to remove those patients from their own families, that the ob-
jects

jects which are most apt to excite those emotions, may be kept from them.

Dr. Reynolds says, that it is usual, for these reasons, amongst others ; what are those other reasons ?

I cannot recollect all those reasons immediately ; some of them are, perhaps, points of etiquette. We should be glad to have the benefit of the experience of such physicians in cases of this kind.

Whether such physicians, who have made this branch of medicine their particular study, do not, from their constant opportunities of making observations upon the cases of persons so disordered, acquire the habit of judging better upon the probability of the recovery of patients, than other physicians who have not made that branch of medicine their particular study, and who have not the same constant opportunities of making the like observations.

That must in a great measure depend upon their relative capability of observing, and upon their fidelity in recording what they observed ; those being equal, the greatest experience must have the preference.

Would Dr. Reynolds think a person, who has made this branch of medicine his particular study for twenty-eight years, and under whose care nine out of ten of the persons who have been put under that care within three months after they had begun to be afflicted with that disorder, had recovered, a person skilful in such cases ?

Yes, if I could believe the fact.

Whether, to induce Dr. Reynolds to believe such a fact, he would not require some further evidence than the assertion of the person who stated himself to have been so successful ?

I certainly should require further evidence than the assertion of any man, to induce me to believe such a fact.

Does Dr. Reynolds consider an assertion made before this Committee, though not upon oath, as made under an obligation, on the part of the person making it, to speak the truth, equal to an assertion made upon oath ?

I consider myself under the same obligation.

If a physician of long experience asserted, that he had from eight to ten patients usually at a time, for five years together, in a house, and never had more than four patients who were not cured within the year, and continued well, as far as he ever knew ; and that, if any of those persons had relapsed, he believed, from the partial opinion of their families, he should have heard of it : he would require further evidence of the truth of that fact ?

I should not be satisfied without further evidence than assertion ; though I do not mean to impeach the credibility of any one.

E

Whether,

Whether, in Dr. Reynolds's opinion, his Majesty's bodily strength has increased, or declined, during the last month?

His Majesty's bodily strength certainly has not declined; I am not competent to judge of any increase of it, for it is not put to any exertion; he appears to be alert and active.

Whether Dr. Reynolds thinks his Majesty's bodily health thriving or declining?

I think his Majesty's general health is improved within the last month.

Whether Dr. Reynolds now entertains hopes of his Majesty's more speedy recovery from his present malady than when he was last examined?

It is impossible to ascertain the time; I cannot venture even to hazard a conjecture.

Whether, after it has become necessary to resort to that particular mode of coercion applied by persons particularly conversant in that branch of medicine, the patient so coerced, is to be considered as affected with the disorder in a greater degree than before such coercion became necessary?

There is a state without turbulence, which equally incapacitates a person from transacting business as the turbulent state which does require coercion.

In which of the two states is there a greater prospect of a speedy recovery?

When a patient afflicted with this malady, who has been turbulent, ceases to be so, he may be said to be in a state more favourable to recovery than while he continued in that turbulent state.

Whether Dr. Reynolds knows, or has any grounds of informing the Committee, whether the majority of persons afflicted with this malady, at his Majesty's time of life, have recovered?

I have not sufficient grounds to answer that question.

Do you consider a perfect state of bodily health, co-existing with a complete mental distemper, a very good symptom towards recovery of the mental disorder?

If a patient shall have been several months, perhaps a year, afflicted with the mental disorder, which disorder remains without diminution, I should not consider perfect bodily health as promissory of recovery from the mental disorder.

Whether the improvement of bodily health, without any proportionate improvement of mental sanity, becomes a probable symptom of mental convalescence?

In a recent case I think it is.

Whether, in the case before us, a state of quiet has not often succeeded a state of irritation, and a state of irritation a state of quiet; and what was the difference observed in each state, with regard to mental sanity in this case?

There

There have been frequently such vicissitudes, and there have been nearer approaches to reason in a state of quiet than in a state of turbulence ; but I think not invariably so : this is to the best of my recollection at present.

Was Dr. Reynolds present at a discussion which took place on Friday, the 2d. instant, between Dr. Willis and Dr. Warren, respecting the account which was that day sent to St. James's ?

I was.

Relate what passed upon that occasion ?

When Dr. Warren came down to Kew on Friday morning the 2d instant, I saw him before he visited his Majesty, and told him how I had found his Majesty the evening before, and that morning when I visited him. After Dr. Warren had waited upon his Majesty, he came into the room where we usually consult, and, after agreeing upon the prescription for the day, we proceeded to consider what report we should send to St. James's ; there were then present in the room, Dr. Warren, Dr. John Willis, and myself ; and, as nearly as I can recollect, Dr. Warren and I agreed upon this report ; " His Majesty passed yesterday " quietly, has had a very good night, and is calm this morning." I wrote it, read it over, and Dr. John Willis objected to it, alledging that it was not descriptive of his Majesty's amendment, for that he certainly was much better, having, on the preceding day and on that morning, said many pertinent and rational things. Dr. Warren contended, that several things said properly proved nothing ; but that some things said immediately afterwards improperly were decisive. Dr. John Willis contended, that a mitigation of symptoms was amendment. Dr. Warren did not consider that any amendment could take place, till there was an interval of an hour, or more, of reason and judgment. While they were in this argument, Dr. Willis, sen. came in, was shewn the report intended to be sent to St. James's, and did not at first reading it disapprove of it ; but upon Dr. John Willis's observing, that it did not contain so favourable an account of His Majesty's situation, as the report which had been sent on the preceding day, he objected to it, contending that there was a material amendment, which ought to be reported.—Dr. Warren and myself, not seeing his Majesty's state in the same light, thought that the report held out sufficient hopes to the public. Doctors Willis, I think both, but I am certain Dr. Willis, sen. observed that the Queen would not suffer it to go so ; and I cannot exactly recollect what words immediately followed, but Dr. Willis, sen. addressing himself to Dr. Warren, said, " that it would fall upon " him ;" That expression I particularly remember.—We talked again upon the subject, and drew up the following report : " His " Majesty passed yesterday much in the same manner as he did " the day before, has had a very good night, and is this morning " as he was yesterday." This report, was carried up stairs, and when returned, it was accompanied with a desire that we would

add to the end of the last sentence, " continuing mending : " I speak to the best of my recollection.—This seemed to Dr. Warren and myself more than the state of his Majesty authorized us to say. Doctor Warren therefore desired the honour of an audience of her Majesty, which was granted : and when he returned, the last part of the report was altered as follows : " and is this morning in a comfortable way," instead of " is this morning as he was yesterday." I speak from memory—I have no notes. Dr. Willis continued arguing warmly with Dr. Warren, while I was writing the three reports—they were in the next room to that in which I was writing—the door wide open ; and I heard Dr. Willis say to Dr. Warren, amongst other expressions of disagreement with him in opinion, that if Dr. Warren held the opinion which he maintained, that it impeached his common sense, or something else ; to which Dr. Warren made no reply, only desired the persons present, among whom were Lady Harcourt, Lady Charlotte Finch, and General Gordon, to observe that Dr. Willis had made use of such an expression. Dr. Warren conducted himself, through the whole of this unpleasant business, with a admirable temper.

Does Dr. Reynolds recollect sufficiently the conversation which passed between Dr. Warren and Dr. Willis upon that Friday, to take upon himself to say positively, whether the following circumstances occurred between those persons at any time that day ; namely, Whether Dr. Willis asked this question of Dr. Warren, or any question to this effect : " If a person in such an indisposition as his Majesty, should not say one sensible word in twenty-four hours, and in the next twenty-four should say but one word, that he would not say if he was not indisposed, whether Dr. Warren would not think him better." If any such question, or any question to that effect, was asked by Dr. Willis, whether Dr. Reynolds can say positively, Dr. Warren did, or did not, answer " No," or what other answer he gave to it ?

I think I recollect that some such Question was proposed by Dr. Willis to Dr. Warren, but I do not remember that Dr. Warren said " No ; " as he admitted, that if a person in the situation of his Majesty, was for the space of one hour, or more, like himself, that he should think him mended. I remember this observation made by one of the Dr. Willis's to Dr. Warren, or something to this purpose. " You will not allow a person in this state to be better till he is well ?"—Yes, I will," said Dr. Warren, " when I see him have an interval for the space of an hour or two, of reason and judgment, but not till then." This is as nearly as I can recollect.

Does Dr. Reynolds recollect what were the words which Dr. Warren had used immediately before one of the Dr. Willis's said to him, " You will not allow a person in this state to be better till he is well ? " " Yes, I will," said Dr. Warren, " when I see him have an interval for the space of an hour or two, of reason and judgment, but not till then." This is as nearly as I can recollect.

No,

No, I do not.

Is the Committee to understand, that Dr. Warren did not answer to Dr. Willis in this argument, "that he should think no person better till they were perfectly well?"

Dr. Warren did not say that in my hearing.

Did he say, in Dr. Reynolds's hearing, "that he should think a person better if he was himself for an hour or two?"

Yes, he did.

Does Dr. Reynolds hold himself responsible in his character, to the public, for the truth of the accounts sent to St. James's, and signed with his name?

I have always wished to give, in that report, as favourable an account of his Majesty's health as I could consistent with truth.

Did Dr. Reynolds ever endeavour to induce Dr. Willis to sign any account of the King's situation, by any vehement argument or dispute, which Dr. Willis declared to be contrary to his opinion?

Never.

Did Dr. Reynolds ever inform Dr. Willis, that it was usual for physicians to sign their names to statements of facts, which they are not sure are true or correct, for the sake of agreement?

I never did.

Did Dr. Reynolds ever tell him, that in such matters the opinion of one should give way to the other two, and that he was surprized he should hesitate about it?

No.

Should not Dr. Reynolds consider the signing his name to any account sent to St. James's, which tended to mislead the public into a less favourable opinion of His Majesty's state than the fact warranted, as equally culpable in him, as the giving untrue information to this committee?

I should think it highly culpable to do so.

When did Dr. Reynolds first hear of the order, that no person should be admitted into his Majesty's apartment, without the permission of Dr. Willis, or his son?

I first observed that written order fixed above the chimney, in the pages room, on Sunday last.

Does Dr. Reynolds know when it was first put up?

I understood it was put up on Friday last; it was not put up when I was last in that room on Friday.

Was that the day on which the difference of opinion happened between Dr. Willis and Dr. Warren?

It was.

Did Dr. Reynolds or Dr. Warren in any measure ground the opinion, which induced them that day to differ from Dr. Willis, upon information received from Mr. Charles Hawkins, or other of the attendants who were then permitted to have access to his Majesty's apartment?

I formed

I formed my opinion from what I personally observed in his Majesty.

Did Dr. Reynolds hear Dr. Warren quote the authority of Mr. Hawkins's representation of the state in which the King had been in, in support of his objection to signing the altered report?

I did hear him,

Does Dr. Reynolds know, or did he ever hear, of any improper persons having intruded, or being admitted, into his Majesty's apartment to make the issuing of that prohibition necessary?

I do not know any thing that has made that prohibition necessary or proper.

By what authority did Dr. Reynolds understand that notice or order to have been fixed up in the pages room?

As it did not seem to me to be signed by any person of authority, I paid no attention to it myself, and made no other enquiries about it, except who put it there; and was told Dr. Willis; but I took a copy of it. I did hear Dr. Willis to-day, in the outer room here, say that it was put up by the authority of the Lord Chancellor, which I did not hear before; he said so in my presence, and, I think in that of Dr. Gisborne.

Whether, in Dr. Reynolds's opinion, the four medical assistants, who are in constant attendance on his Majesty, are not competent to give information worthy the attention of this committee, in addition to that of the physicians?

I think them all men of sense and judgment, and believe them to be men of integrity.

In what state did Dr. Reynolds leave his Majesty to-day?

Pretty much; I think, in the same state as when I saw him the time before—a state of composure and quiet, but not in a mended state respecting his mind.

Whether the four medical persons do not, from time to time, report to the physicians the several circumstances of his Majesty's case, in order to enable those physicians to form their judgment upon his Majesty's case?

The physicians form their judgment from what they hear of his Majesty in their absence, and from what they personally observe when they have the honour to wait upon him.

Whether the physicians do not receive information, with respect to what passes in their absence, from the reports of these medical gentlemen, or some of them?

They do receive information from them, and require it from all who they think are capable of giving them useful information.

Dr. Reynolds having said, that the chance of his Majesty's recovery is certainly as good now, in his opinion, as it was when he was formerly examined before the other committee—Is that Dr. Reynolds's opinion, after giving due attention to all the circumstances which he has mentioned in his examination this day, and all other circumstances which have fallen under his observation,

servation, and notwithstanding any difference of opinion which may have arisen between any of his Majesty's physicians?

It is my opinion.

Withdrew.

Veneris, 9o. Die Januarii, 1789.

Dr. THOMAS GISBORNE *called in and examined.*

WHETHER, in his opinion, the state of his Majesty's health does, or does not, continue to be such as to render his Majesty incapable, either of coming to Parliament, or of attending to public business?

I think him incapable of coming to Parliament, or of attending to public business.

What hopes does Dr. Gisborne now entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

I think, as before, that there are still hopes of his Majesty's recovery.

Can Dr. Gisborne now form any judgment, or probable conjecture, of the time that his Majesty's illness is likely to last?

No, I cannot.

Whether in his Majesty's disorder Dr. Gisborne sees any present signs of convalescence?

I think the state of his Majesty's bodily health is better than it was three weeks ago, and that he is more quiet;—it may therefore be hoped, that these possibly may be the prelude to further amendment.

Whether the state of his Majesty's bodily health is now perfectly good, or has been at any time since the commencement of his present disorder?

I think that can hardly be said.

Whether his Majesty's particular malady arises from the state of his bodily health, to which Dr. Gisborne alludes?

No, I think not.

Whether you have ever endeavoured to influence or persuade Dr. Willis to join in any report of the state of his Majesty's health, contrary to his, Dr. Willis's judgment upon it?

Never.

Do you know any other physician that has?

No.

Did you ever inform Dr. Willis that it was usual for physicians to sign their names to statements of facts, which they are not sure are true or correct, for the sake of agreement?

No.

Did you ever tell him, that in such matters, the opinion of one should give way to two, and that you was surprised he should hesitate about such matters?

No.

Would

Would any motive or argument induce you to sign your name to the account sent to St. James's, respecting the state of the King's health, which you did not in your conscience believe to be substantially true?

Certainly not.

Should you not consider the signing your name to an account of that sort, tending to mislead the public into a less favourable opinion of his Majesty's state than the fact warranted, in the same point of view as giving information to mislead this committee?

Yes.

Whether, if there has been any errors or imperfection in the accounts sent to St. James's, you conceive it to have consisted in representing his Majesty's state to be worse than it is?

I know of no error; and I was ever as cautious as possible, that the hopes or fears of the public should not be misled.

Whether the report sent to St. James's does always contain a full state of his Majesty's real situation?

I think it impossible that it should.

Has it ever been mentioned his Majesty's malady at all?

I think his Majesty's malady is easily to be collected from it.

Is there any thing in such reports that tends to give the public any idea of his Majesty's convalescence from, or, growing worse in the symptoms of, his peculiar malady?

There have hitherto hardly been any symptoms of either kind to be told.

When did you see or hear of the order that no person should be admitted into his Majesty's apartments without the leave of Dr. Willis or his son?

I forget; I believe about a week ago.

Do you know, or have you ever heard, that any improper persons have been admitted into his Majesty's apartment, to make that order necessary?

No; I know of no improper persons.

By what authority do you understand that order to have been issued?

I was told it was put up at Dr. Willis's desire.

Whether you ever learnt what authority Dr. Willis had for putting up that order?

I think I heard him say he thought too many people went in to the King, and that the Chancellor advised him to do that, or something else, to prevent it.

Had too many or any improper people been admitted, to your knowledge?

Not to my knowledge;—I was not constantly there, therefore cannot tell.

Were not three persons of Dr. Willis's own family, himself included, of the number of those who went in to the King?

Yes.

Is

Is there not one of that family who is no medical attendant ?
One of them is a clergyman, and, I believe, does not call himself a physician.

Does Dr. Gisborne know whether any persons have gone in to his Majesty at improper times ?

No ; I do not.

Does Dr. Gisborne know whether his Majesty has, or has not been prevented from sleeping by the circumstance of any person going into his room ?

No ; I do not know that.

Has he been prevented from sleeping ?

I do not know.

Did Dr. Gisborne understand by that order, that the Physicians themselves were not to be permitted to see the King, without Dr. Willis's or his son's permission.

The words of the paper are, that no persons, except the pages, shall be permitted.

Then you did understand it to extend to the physicians ?

Yes.

Does Dr. Gisborne, when he goes to Kew, make enquiry of all or any of the four medical attendants who are in constant waiting on his Majesty, to assist himself by their information, in forming his opinion on the King's state ?

Yes, I do.

Does Dr. Gisborne conceive that he should be deprived of the means of material information, if all those gentlemen were excluded from access to his Majesty's apartment ?

Yes,

Did Dr. Gisborne hear of any dispute, or material difference of opinion, which had arisen on Friday, the 2d instant, between Dr. Willis and Dr. Warren ?

None, relative to the treatment of his Majesty.

Did you hear of any such dispute, or difference of opinion, relative to the state or condition of his Majesty ?

No.

Whether, in Dr. Gisborne's opinion, the four medical assistants who are in constant attendance on his Majesty, are not competent to give information worthy the attention of this Committee, in addition to that of the physicians ?

Yes, surely.

Whether any medicine is administered to the King, by the prescription of Dr. Willis, unknown to the other physicians ?

No.

Whether there has been any particular medicine, at the suggestion of Dr. Willis, and soon after his arrival, administered to the King ?

Not without consultation of the rest, that I know of.

F

Does

Does Dr. Gisborne recollect Dr. Willis having recommended any particular medicine, in order to meet and counteract what he, Dr. Willis, conceived to be the cause of his Majesty's malady?

I do not think I understand the question.

Does not Dr. Gisborne imagine, from this account given by Dr. Willis, viz. "That from the particular detail of his Majesty's mode and manner of life for 27 years, I do imagine, that weighty business, severe exercise, and too great abstemiousness, and little rest, has been too much for his constitution. It is very early to give an opinion, and I may be mistaken; but I am the more inclined to think myself right, because the medicine that has been given his Majesty ever since Sunday morning, and was intended to meet and counteract those causes, has had as much effect as I could wish," that Dr. Willis refers to some medicine recommended by himself?

I suppose he does.

What was that medicine which had the effect stated by Dr. Willis, in counteracting those causes of his Majesty's malady, namely, "weighty business, severe exercise, too great abstemiousness and little rest, for a course of 27 years?"

I have not the recipe in my pocket.

Does Dr. Gisborne recollect whether there was any thing peculiar and new in the medicine?

The medicine was approved of in consultation by us all.

Have you no recollection what it was, it having produced, as Dr. Willis states, as much effect as he could wish, and counteracting all those causes?

I think these are questions for Dr. Willis alone to answer.

Had the medicine, in your judgment, any effect in meeting and counteracting those causes?

I think none of our medicines have had the effect to be wished.

Was his Majesty gradually better, from the first six hours after he took it, to the time of your former examination before the Committee?

Not materially, that I know of.

Whether since the order alluded to, Dr. Gisborne continues to have every means of observation and information which he deems necessary to direct his judgment upon the actual state of his Majesty's health?

Yes, I have.

Whether Dr. Gisborne observes any material difference in his Majesty, at such times as he visits him in the presence of Dr. Willis or his son, and at such times when neither of those gentlemen are present?

I think he is more quiet when they are present.

Does Dr. Gisborne know that any of the four medical assistants have, at any time, been refused admission to his Majesty, and thereby prevented from procuring the information necessary to be laid before the physicians?

I really

I really do not know.

Has Dr. Gisborne ever heard them complain of any such refusal?

I have not heard them complain.

Whether before that order, any of the medical attendants saw his Majesty early in the morning, before any of the physicians, or sat up with him in the night?

Yes—they have, I believe, got up to him in the night—I believe they never sat up with him—they have seen him early in the morning before the physicians.

Whether, since that order, they have been permitted to see him as usual, without Dr. Willis or his son's being present?

I don't know.

Since that order, in what manner, when those medical gentlemen are called upon by the physicians, do they make that report?—Do they make it in the presence of Dr. Willis and his son, or by themselves?

It is accidental—whether they are present or not.

Dr. Gisborne having observed, that in the presence of Dr. Willis or his son, his Majesty is more quiet, he thinks—Whether Dr. Gisborne apprehends that the reducing a patient, labouring under his disorder, into a state of quiet, is, or is not, likely to be one of the means of bringing about his recovery?

I think quiet to be good for such patients.

Whether, if the effect of Dr. Willis's presence is to render his Majesty more quiet, it does not make any judgment formed of the state of his Majesty's mind at that time more uncertain?

No.

Whether Dr. Gisborne does not think that the judgment formed of the state of his Majesty's mind, by a physician seeing his Majesty in the presence of Dr. Willis, might be different from that which he would form if Dr. Willis was not present?

Not if he were a physician of judgment.

Whether Dr. Gisborne, in his conscience, thinks, after duly attending to all the circumstances of his Majesty's case, which he has related to this Committee, and to all the circumstances of his Majesty's case which have fallen under his observation, or come to his knowledge, and notwithstanding any disputes which may have taken place between his Majesty's physicians, or any of them, either relative to his Majesty's case, or other subjects, that his Majesty's chance of recovery is greater, or less, than it was, or as good as it was, when Dr. Gisborne was examined here by the former Committee?

The time elapsed is short, and therefore I think the chance as good.

Withdrew.

The Rev. Dr. FRANCIS WILLIS *again called in and examined.*

Whether, the several circumstances of his Majesty's case, which have fallen within your observation, or come to your knowledge, being duly attended to, you, in your conscience, think that the chance of his Majesty's recovery is greater, or less, than, or as good as, it was when you was examined before the former committee ?

Much greater.

When Dr. Willis says, that the chance of his Majesty's recovery is much greater, does he found his idea that the chance is much greater upon his observation that, in his Majesty's case, such circumstances have occurred as he has usually observed in the case of persons who have laboured under the same malady and afterwards recovered ?

Certainly. Yes.

Does Dr. Willis consider his Majesty's age as making a material difference in the chance of his Majesty's recovering or not recovering, after duly attending to all the circumstances of his Majesty's case which have fallen within his observation, and come to his knowledge ?

I do not judge that the age is of any signification, unless the patient had been afflicted before with the same malady.

Dr. Willis having stated to the committee, that his Majesty, a fortnight ago, would take up books and could not read a line, but that he will now read several pages, and make, in his opinion, very good remarks upon the subject ; Does Dr. Willis's observation and experience of what has happened in other, cases, enable him to say that such a circumstance does, or does not, afford him a more solid ground of hope of his Majesty's recovery, than he had when he was examined before the former committee ?

Certainly a more solid ground of hope of his Majesty's recovery.

Is that hope the effect of the Doctor's judgment, formed upon his experience of 27 or 28 years ?

Certainly.

In the judgment of Dr. Willis, who has said that his Majesty is very irritable, is his Majesty more or less frequently in an actual state of irritation than he was about the time when Dr. Willis was examined before the former committee ?

Nothing near so frequently irritated ; and when irritated, the irritation does not last a tenth part so long.

Has Dr. Willis, in his observation and experience, or has he not, remarked, that a change of the same nature has usually taken place in the case of patients who have afterwards recovered ?

Yes.

Dr. Willis having said, in his examination before the former committee, that his Majesty's irritation had then in a great measure subsided ; did Dr. Willis mean, when he so expressed himself, that

that the irritation was at that time less than it had been when he first saw his Majesty; or did he mean to suggest, that the irritation had then subsided in such a degree as to make what Dr. Willis calls firm coercion unnecessary?

I was at that time in hopes that the irritability would not be so great as to require any firm coercion; and perhaps, had there been no blisters applied to his Majesty's legs, which had an effect upon his nervous system, which I was not aware of, from being told that his Majesty was scarce sensible of the blisters that had been applied at Windsor, there never would have been any occasion for such coercion; but his Majesty's blisters not operating kindly, had a very extraordinary effect, as I thought, upon his whole system, and made me sensible that we were wrong in applying the blisters—though perhaps in the end they may not have retarded a cure: for the same medicines that I apprehend had abated his Majesty's irritability at that time, have been continued ever since, except about eight days; and I have reason to think has had the intended effect.

Whether, in point of fact, when Dr. Willis was examined before the former committee, his Majesty's irritation at that time had in a great measure subsided?

It had subsided greatly, in comparison to what it was when I first came, and first saw his Majesty, and gave me great hopes that the medicine was given with a proper intention.

What did the medicine, which has had the effect you speak of, consist of?

The bark and saline medicines occasionally. The bark sometimes every four hours, and sometimes a saline draught.

Whether any pills were part of this system of medicine?

We thought it necessary to give occasionally, within those eight days, alterative pills, with a very trifling part of calomel.

Whether his Majesty had not taken bark before you prescribed for him?

I understood his Majesty had at Windsor, for one day or two,—but I do not know; upon enquiry, it was thought his Majesty was calmer afterwards.

Whether the medicine which you mentioned in your examination before the former committee, as having been given his Majesty since the Sunday preceding that examination, was according to the accounts which you had received, understood to be different from the medicine which his Majesty had been in the course of taking for some time before that Sunday?

Very different, to the best of my memory and information; indeed it was mentioned to me, that it was intended to give his Majesty that medicine, if they had not expected my coming.

Whether you, when you first attended his Majesty, did not look over the file of prescriptions made before you came to attend his Majesty?

I do

I did not, but had a general account from Dr. Warren, as we went down to Kew, what medicines had been given.

Dr. Willis having said, in his examination before the committee, that he kept a house for 28 years for the reception of persons afflicted with this disorder; whether he can give to the committee an account of the gross number of persons entertained in his house, from his first admitting such patients to the present time?

I can give no account.

If you can give no account at present, have you no means, by consulting your papers, of giving that information to the committee?

Not any; I have not kept any account at all.

Can you inform the committee what number of persons have been dismissed from your house as radically cured, from the beginning of your undertaking this business?

I can give no account: nor have I been confined to one house or ten houses, because I put the patients to such places as suited their pecuniary circumstances.

Having said that this business was not confined to one, but to many houses, whether you can give any account upon the whole of the number of persons radically cured?

Not at all.

If you can give no account to the committee of the whole number of persons that have been received at your houses, and no account of the number of patients that have been dismissed from your houses as radically cured, upon what ground did you say, in your former examination, that you do not think you should speak false, if you said, that nine out of ten, of those that had been put under your care, within three months after they had begun to be afflicted with the disorder, had recovered?

My first calculation and observation, concerning the numbers cured, was from my remarking that the first fifteen were cured; and I had often recollected, upon retrospection, that ten had gone together, and that I very rarely missed curing any that I had so early under my care; I mean radically cured.

Whether, from all the circumstances Dr. Willis has stated, in his answers to the preceding questions, relative to the actual state of his Majesty's health, he has reason to entertain hopes of his Majesty's more speedy recovery, than when he was examined before the former committee?

Yes.

Upon what particular grounds are those hopes founded?

Because every bad symptom is abated, and his Majesty will attend to any subject, in a much better manner than I ever hoped he would do within this period of time.

Whether, in those patients who have been completely cured within five or six months, a considerable progress towards acts of convalescence has been generally made within the first month?

No.

Has

Has the progress now made in his Majesty's case, been as great, or greater, than has been usually made within the same time in such cases?

I think greater.

In Dr. Willis's answer to the second question put to him, when he was last examined before this committee, why has he spoken less positively of the certainty of his Majesty's cure, as at present situated, than he would of a patient under the same indisposition in his house?

On account of his station in life, which requires more attendance, and more persons to see his Majesty: also, his Majesty's ideas of who he is, and the feelings that his present indisposition may occasion.

Whether patients labouring under this indisposition, while under Dr. Willis's care, are usually under such a degree of controul in his presence, as to influence their conversation and behaviour?

Very frequently.

Whether a person, who has not particularly dedicated himself to this branch of medicine, is able to form a certain judgment of the state of the mind of a patient so afflicted, by seeing and conversing with such patient only in the presence of Dr. Willis, or of any other person who has acquired the same degree of influence over the patient?

Yes, if they converse with him for a length of time, and frequently.

Dr. Willis having said that he can give no account of the numbers who have been under his care, he is desired to inform the committee, as well as he can from memory, what the number may have been?

They certainly amount to many hundreds; I have attended many in Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire, who were not in my house.

Dr. Willis having said that his first fifteen patients were cured, and had often recollected, on retrospection, that ten had gone together; does he mean to say, that he had often recollected one instance of ten going together, or that he had recollected many instances of ten going together?

Several instances of ten going away successively,

Does Dr. Willis mean that ten persons, who had come successively one after another, had all gone away cured, consequently that no one of those ten had remained uncured?

I mean that.

From Dr. Willis's observations upon his Majesty since his examination before the former committee, is he confirmed or altered in his opinion, that weighty business, severe exercise, too great abstemiousness, and little rest, have contributed to occasion his Majesty's present complaint?

Yes, confirmed.

From whence do you derive this confirmation of your opinion?
From quiet and the effect of tonic medicines:

Whether

Whether those circumstances which Dr. Willis has particularly mentioned, in stating the ground of his more favourable hopes of his Majesty's recovery, have been communicated or known to the other physicians ?

I have told the physicians my opinion, and gave my reasons for it, and have kept nothing a secret from them.

Whether the pills you mention to have been given his Majesty within these eight days, have been given upon your suggestion ?

Yes.

Whether you recollect if any pill, with a portion of calomel in it, had been given a little before the time of your former examination ?

Yes ; it was the first night I came, I believe it made two pills ; and it was thought right that his Majesty should have a cathartic draught the morning after, in order to prepare him for the bark.

Whether the calomel pills were the medicine which you alluded to, when, in your former examination, you say, " that the medicine given his Majesty ever since Sunday morning, and intended to meet and counteract the causes of his Majesty's malady, had had as much effect as you could wish ? "

The pills and the draught were, as I said before, preparative to his taking the bark, which was the medicine I alluded to.

Whether the bark was given, at the time alluded to by your suggestion ?

Yes.

Withdrew.

DR. RICHARD WARREN *again called in and examined.*

Dr. Warren desires the two following questions and answers to be read ; viz.

Q. " Whether Dr. Warren ever saw any paper, purporting to be a copy of this letter supposed to be written at twelve o'clock at night ; and if he did, by whom the same was shewn to him ? "

A. " I do not recollect that I ever saw a paper purporting to be a copy of it.

Q. " Can Dr. Warren take upon himself to say, that he never did see any paper purporting to be a copy of the letter supposed to be written at twelve o'clock at night ? "

A. " No ; I do not recollect that I did."

Dr. Warren then stated,

Late on Wednesday night, the committee asked me whether I had not seen a copy, or something that purported to be the copy of a letter supposed to be written by Dr. Willis to Mr. Pitt, at twelve o'clock at night, during the debate on the day of the first division in the House of Commons. I could not at that time, recollect any thing to which I could apply the word " copy ; " but the next morning I recollected, that on my arrival at Kew, the

the day after I heard the rumour of such a letter being written, Sir Lucas Pepys informed me that he had a message for me from the Prince of Wales, who had been at Kew the night before, and had ordered him to deliver the message to me when I should come the next morning. Sir Lucas had taken the message down in writing, from his memory, soon after the Prince left him. The message was to desire me to enquire into the state of his Majesty's health at a particular time, because the Prince had been informed that a letter had been written by Dr. Willis, stating, that the King was in a very good way at that time, when the Prince had understood that he really was not so, and then recited other words of the supposed letter, which I cannot recollect. I do not remember that I took this paper from Sir Lucas. I remember that, in talking about this letter, I made use of the word "copy," when I ought rather to have said, that I had only seen an account of the letter in writing. The first account of such letter being written, I learnt from rumour; the next information that I had of it was from the message delivered to me by Sir Lucas Pepys.

Whether, in consequence of the message delivered to Dr. Warren by Sir Lucas Pepys, he did, or did not, afterwards inform the Prince of Wales of the enquiry which he had made, with respect to the truth of the supposed fact which was the subject of that message, and of the circumstances which had taken place between Dr. Warren and Dr. Willis, in consequence of that enquiry?

I did; and the next day, or second day after, I acquainted the Prince that I had done wrong with respect to Dr. Willis, as I could not find that any letter had been written by him at the time mentioned; that I must retract what I had said to Dr. Willis, and acknowledged my error.—He approved of my intended conduct.

Is Dr. Warren still unable to name any other person besides Sir Lucas Pepys, from whom he received information that Dr. Willis, had written the letter in question?

I positively declare, that I do not know from whom I first heard the report, and I paid very little attention to it till I received the message from Sir Lucas.

Had Doctor Warren, upon his last examination, when he said that he did not recollect from whom he received his information, that the letter mentioned in the former question had been written, and said, that the substance of the supposed letter had been stated to him in general terms, forgotten the circumstance of a message having been delivered to him from the Prince of Wales, by Sir Lucas Pepys upon that subject, such as he has now stated?

I declare positively, from the fatigue of examination, or some other circumstance, I know not what, I could not recollect it; I took pains about it as soon as I left the committee, and, as I was going to Kew the next morning, I gradually made it out, and immediately determined to acquaint the committee with it as soon as

I had an opportunity, though I knew it was at the expence of appearing to have concealed the truth the night before.

When did Dr. Warren put in writing what he had thus recollected on his road to Kew ?

Soon after I got home yesterday.

Did Dr. Warren communicate this paper to any body before he read it to the committee ?

I communicated it to my brother this morning ; I read it to the Prince of Wales about noon ; I read it over with my son this afternoon.

Does Dr. Warren understand that the Prince of Wales, having heard the same report which he (Dr. Warren) had heard before, desired Dr. Warren, through Sir Lucas Pepys, to enquire into these contradictory reports, as stated in the message delivered by Sir Lucas Pepys ?

Yes.

Did the Prince of Wales direct Dr. Warren to take any further measure, or to make any communication to any other person on the subject.

No.—I am not quite sure whether he did not desire me to speak to the Chancellor upon it.

Whether Dr. Warren knows, or has any reason to believe that Dr. Willis has signed more favourable accounts of the King's health than Dr. Willis believed to be true, though Dr. Warren differed in opinion with him ?

I cannot possibly tell what Dr. Willis believes.

Question repeated.

I do not know ; I cannot assign any reason to believe it, but that it differs very much from my own way of thinking.

Whether Dr. Warren has received any advice, counsel, or command, from any person, to represent the king's malady in a worse condition than he found it ?

No.

From whom did Dr. Warren receive directions, and to whom did he conceive himself accountable, in his conduct and attendance on his Majesty, while his Majesty remained at Windsor since the commencement of his present malady ?

The Prince of Wales.

Did the Prince of Wales then take upon him to direct that the orders, advice, and regulations of the physicians should be duly carried into execution ?

Yes.

Whether, since the order alluded to, forbidding any person to go into the King's room, except introduced by Dr. Willis or his son, Dr. Warren has continued to have such means of observation and information as are sufficient to enable him to form an accurate judgment upon the state of his Majesty's health ?

Yes.

Whether

Whether Dr. Warren has observed any difference in his Majesty, at such times as he has seen and conversed with his Majesty in the presence of Dr. Willis or his son, and at such times when neither of those gentlemen were present?

A very great difference; when Dr. Willis or his son are present, his Majesty is under great awe; when they are absent, he talks and acts very differently.

Since the order alluded to, has Dr. Warren seen his Majesty, except in the presence of one of the Dr. Willis's?

Yesterday I desired Dr. John Willis to retire while I was with his Majesty, that I might observe the difference of his behaviour, and report it to the committee, if required—Dr. Willis retired accordingly, and his Majesty immediately held a language very different from that which he used while Dr. Willis was present.

Was any other person in the room besides Dr. Warren, when Dr. Willis retired?

Two of the pages.

Whether, notwithstanding the order alluded to, Dr. Warren still continues to think himself fully authorized to visit his Majesty as often as he shall judge necessary, without either of the Dr. Willis's being present?

I have made it a rule, ever since Dr. Willis came, not to go in without asking the doctor or his son, whether it was a proper time; but I should go in, notwithstanding that order, if I thought there was a necessity for it.

Whether Dr. Warren does not think, that it is in general discreet to ask Dr. Willis, or his son, whether the time at which Dr. Warren proposes to go into his Majesty's room, was a proper time for that purpose, supposing there is no particular necessity for acting otherwise?

Certainly!

Whether Dr. Warren has ever been present with his Majesty, when he has entertained himself with reading?

Yes.

Has it been for any considerable space of time, and upon a subject which would require much thinking?

I have never seen him read more than a line and a half at a time.

Has that been lately?

The third time from hence that I was there—on Sunday last, I think.

Whether Dr. Warren thinks that the King's malady is less at those times of reading, than at any other times?

His manner of reading, when I have been present, is a strong proof of the existence of his malady.

Whether or no, the patient suffering any writings or discourses to be read without interruption, by persons who have acquired any influence over him, appears to Dr. Warren to be any symptom of convalescence?

No.

Whether or no, since the commencement of the King's malady, the physicians have employed whatever succours the rules of their art, or their experience, have suggested to them towards his recovery ?

Yes.

Whether or no there are not certain distempers supervening on the original malady, such as fever, which are sometimes known to aid in the cure of this distemper ?

Yes.

Whether any fever has come upon his Majesty since the commencement of his malady ?

Yes.

Has the disorder abated, in any remarkable manner, in consequence of that fever ?

No.

Has not his Majesty had frequent and refreshing sleep from time to time ?

Yes.

Has not that been known to be of sovereign use in the cure of this malady ?

A person sick in this manner is not likely to get well without sleep ; but he may frequently have refreshing sleep without advancing in his cure.

How has it been in this case ?

Sleep has produced no advancement towards the cure.

Has any rational mode of controul and coercion been omitted ?

Not that I know of, since his Majesty came to Kew.

Whether any progress towards a cure has been observed in consequence of this controul ?

No.

What was the method which the physicians meant to pursue, in the medical treatment of his Majesty, immediately previous to the arrival of Dr. Willis ?

The method that we had settled to pursue, was that of endeavouring to restore his Majesty to the best bodily health we could ; to make his constitution, if we possibly could, such a one as a healthy man has at fifty.—We attempted to give his Majesty the bark twice, I believe, at Windsor, but some circumstance arising, either from fever, or some other cause, prevented our going on with it. It was determined, I think, just before Dr. Willis came, that the bark should be attempted again ; but it was postponed till the arrival of Dr. Willis, that we might talk with him upon the subject.—I carried Dr. Willis to Kew in my chaise, and gave him an account of his Majesty's mode of living, former habits, and present disease.—He agreed with me, that an endeavour to restore the constitution by the bark, and occasionally adding some other medicines, which we discoursed about, was the most likely way to restore his Majesty's health again. His Majesty was immediately put under this course.

Is

Is Dr. Warren quite sure that the return of the use of the bark, after Dr. Willis's arrival, did not happen on the suggestion of Dr. Willis?

It did not happen on the suggestion of Dr. Willis.

Whether the medicines just stated by Dr. Warren to have been used during the period immediately preceding Dr. Willis's arrival, were not of the class called tonics?

I think they were not; but medicines preparatory to the use of the bark.

Whether tonics had not been used a short time previous to Dr. Willis's arrival?

I do not recollect any tonic but bark.

Whether the bark itself is not of that class of medicines called tonic?

It is.

What new medicines, not in the previous intentions of the physicians, were suggested by him, previous to the time of his examination before the former committee?

One of the first things he proposed was calomel.

What benefits were had from the calomel?

None with respect to the main complaint.

Whether or no there has not been frequent returns of irritation, since the time of Dr. Willis's attendance on the King?

Yes.

Were the returns of these irritations owing to the use of blisters?

Dr. Willis was of opinion, and declared, that he never knew blisters applied to the legs of such a patient without benefit: The blisters were applied, and, contrary to what happened when blisters were applied before, produced much soreness and pain. The pain undoubtedly made his Majesty much more unquiet, increased the necessity of coercion, but did not appear to me to increase or diminish the grand malady.

Whether or no Dr. Willis consented to the putting on of these blisters, upon a representation, that the King, when at Windsor, had been hardly sensible of pain from them?

That circumstance was mentioned to Dr. Willis, but I could not think it his motive for consenting to the putting on of the blisters, because he frequently talked of the great benefit that persons, afflicted like his Majesty, usually received from blisters, and mentioned, if I mistake not, his having cured a person by the application of several blisters at once.

Then there was no persuasion used to induce Dr. Willis to consent to the use of blisters?

No.

At what time, to the best of Dr. Warren's recollection, were these blisters used?

I believe something more than three weeks ago.

Has

Has there been any irritation since the blistered parts have been healed?

I am not quite sure that they are healed now, but certainly very near it.

Whether or no Dr. Warren has got the account respecting the proportion of persons cured, who had been afflicted with the disorder about the age of fifty?

I have not got it—I will endeavour to get it before the committee breaks up, if I possibly can.

Whether Dr. Warren, in the difference of opinion which he had with Dr. Willis on Friday the 2d instant, told Dr. Willis that he should think no person better, till they were perfectly well, under such an indisposition?

No.

Do you recollect Dr. Willis's asking you, whether, if a person so indisposed should not say one sensible word in twenty-four hours, and the next twenty-four say but one word, that he would not say if he was not indisposed, whether he would not think him better?—and, if such a question was put, did you answer to this, "No"?

I don't recollect that that question was so put, therefore can say nothing as to the answer.

Do you recollect giving any opinion upon that subject, and what was it?

I stated to the doctor my rule of determining whether persons so indisposed had amended, which I mentioned in the former part of my examination, and the opinion I gave on recovery was founded on that rule. I remember that the doctrine of recovery, as derived from what happens in a fever, was declared by me, in contradiction to Dr. Willis, as inapplicable to the disorder in question.

Did you ever inform Dr. Willis, that it was usual for physicians to sign their names to statements of facts, which they are not sure are true and correct, for the sake of agreement?

No, not to that effect.

Did you ever inform Dr. Willis, that in such matters the opinion of one should give way to the other two, and that you was surprized that he should hesitate about it?

No.

Did you ever endeavour, by any vehement argument or dispute, to induce Dr. Willis to sign his name to any account respecting the King's state, contrary to his opinion?

I have endeavoured by debate, but not my vehement argument, to bring the doctor over to my opinion, but never to persuade him to act contrary to his own.

Do you consider yourself as responsible in your character to the public, for the truth of the accounts sent to St. James's, provided you sign your name?

Yes, provided you do not mean the whole truth.

Should

Should you not consider the signing your name to any such account of the King's health, tending to deceive the public into a less favourable opinion of his Majesty's state than the fact warranted, in the same point of view as giving information tending to mislead this committee ?

Yes.

If there has been any error or imperfection in the accounts sent to St. James's, has it, in your opinion, consisted in representing the King's state worse than it is ?

No.

When did Dr. Warren see his Majesty last ?

Yesterday.

In what state did you then leave him ?

No better than since the commencement of his disorder.

Whether, Dr. Warren having said, in answer to a question put to him by this committee, that his hopes of his Majesty's recovery stand upon the same foundation as they did when he was examined before, excepting that a little more time has passed, which does not add to his hopes, but is so little that it hardly ought to subtract from them—that is Dr. Warren's opinion, after attending duly to all the circumstances which have been stated in his examination now relative to supervening fever, the enjoyment of sleep, the use of coercion and controul, the frequent returns of irritation, the effect of blisters, the differences of opinion between the physicians, and all other circumstances in his Majesty's case, which have come to the knowledge, or fallen within the observation of Dr. Warren ?

Yes.

Whether or no, in fact, there has existed a difference of opinion respecting the treatment of his Majesty's disorder ?

There has been no difference of opinion with respect to his medicines and diet.

Whether Dr. Warren has ever known a case of so long difficulty and continuance, and where so many physicians have attended to, where there was less difference of opinion ?

No, with respect to medicines and diet.

Whether Dr. Warren thinks that the difference of opinion, respecting the signs of convalescence, has tended to forward, or retard, the cure, or to alter the mode of treatment ?

It has neither forwarded nor retarded the cure, nor altered the mode of treatment.

Whether Dr. Warren, from the beginning, has grounded his hopes of his Majesty's recovery, upon the symptoms he has observed in his Majesty's case, or on calculations of the proportionate numbers cured to the persons affected with this malady ?

On the calculations.

Whether there has been any difference of opinion among the physicians attending his Majesty, on any point, since the commencement of his Majesty's disorder ?

Not

Not with respect to medicines and diet. Some difference of opinion at Windsor, whether his Majesty was not going to recover, about the end of his fever.

As Dr. Warren stated that he believes he is correct in his account of the words used by Dr. Willis, viz. "A certain great person will not suffer it to go so, and it will fall upon you," and thought the conversation material enough to put down a memorandum of it as soon as he returned home; can he state how long it was after he left Kew before he got home?

I left Kew about twelve, I believe, and got home about six.

Did Dr. Warren go straight home?

No, I went about my business.

Whether Dr. Warren mentioned the particulars of the conversation to any body before he put them down in his memorandum?

I did.

Withdrew.

Sabbati, 10. Die Januarii, 1789.

Rev. Dr. FRANCIS WILLIS *again called in and examined.*

DID Dr. Willis, when he spoke yesterday concerning the medicines which had been given to his majesty between the time of his former examination and the Sunday preceding, mean to take upon himself to say positively, either that those medicines had, or that they had not, been previously thought of by the other physicians attending his Majesty?

I think I said that they had been thought of.

Do you mean to take upon yourself to say, that of your own knowledge, and in your own presence, his Majesty has, within the last fortnight, read several pages of books, making at the same time what were, in your opinion, good remarks upon the subject of them?

Yes.

Whether, according to the observations which your experience has enabled you to make in cases such as that of his Majesty, the patient's reading, or suffering books to be read, in the manner in which his Majesty has done within this last fortnight, is, or is not, a circumstance which has, in point of fact, happened where the patient has finally recovered?

Yes, certainly, in several cases, and it is more particularly favourable in his Majesty's, as, within the space of fourteen days, or thereabouts, his Majesty could not attend or read at all.

Whether

Whether your observation upon cases in which recovery has been obtained, induces you to consider the circumstance of a patient having, from time to time, refreshing sleep as forming a solid ground of hope for recovery?

It is necessary to know the sleep that the patient formerly had required, to make the comparison of any effect.

Whether, from the accounts which you have received of the sleep which his Majesty formerly usually had, and comparing the result of such accounts, with the refreshing sleep which his Majesty has had, your observations and experience enables you to determine one way or the other, whether the circumstance of his Majesty's having had such sleep, is a ground to hope for recovery?

By comparing the sleep his Majesty, I am told, formerly had, even after great fatigue, I am inclined to think that his Majesty has, for these last six or seven nights, had more sleep than one could expect from a person who has been used to so much exercise, and has not been able of late to use any.

Whether his Majesty is, within the last fortnight, more or less quiet than he was previous to the time when you was examined before the former committee?

I cannot remember it; but there is a prodigious difference indeed.

Whether, judging from actual experience, and from what has occurred in the case of persons who have recovered from this malady, you think that such alteration, as you mention in your answer to the last question, affords a solid ground of hope that his Majesty will recover?

Yes, very solid grounds; for, indeed, I do not think his Majesty has one symptom that ever attended an incurable. I mean, that he may have symptoms that incurables have, but he has not symptoms that mark an incurable.

Can you, from your own experience, say whether his Majesty has any symptoms that are never observed in incurables?

I cannot say.

Dr. Addington having said, in his examination before the former committee, that he had great expectations that his Majesty's disorder would end happily, from this circumstance, "That it had not for its forerunner that melancholy which usually precedes a tedious illness of this sort," does Dr. Willis, judging from facts and experience, concur with Dr. Addington in those expectations?

Entirely.

Whether Dr. Willis and his son have not, in point of fact, a greater influence and controul over his Majesty than any other of the physicians who attend him.

Certainly, much more so.

H

Whether

Whether Dr. Willis, judging from facts and experience, does, or does not, think it absolutely necessary, in order to bring about the cure of his Majesty, that some person attending his Majesty constantly should have and exert that degree of influence and controul?

Most certainly.

Whether Dr. Willis, judging from facts and experience, can say, that such irritations as his Majesty may have, when visited by persons in the absence of those that have this degree of influence and controul, may, or may not, retard his Majesty's recovery?

It certainly may retard it.

Whether that effect must not depend on the conduct of those persons who visit his Majesty in the absence of Dr. Willis?

On their conduct if his Majesty sees them frequently in the day, but if only once in two or three days, it will disturb his Majesty, by creating fresh ideas.

Whether Dr. Willis is of opinion, that the other physicians who attend his Majesty, visiting his Majesty in the manner they have done since Dr. Willis attended on his Majesty, can have the effect of producing that irritation, which Dr. Willis has said may retard his Majesty's recovery?

I have thought that it frequently has had that effect.

Whether supposing that Dr. Willis attended one person in the manner in which he now attends his Majesty and had the care of another person, of whose case he should receive accounts only every other morning, he thinks he could promote the cure of his Majesty and such other person in an equal degree?

The other person would not have other people to visit him, and consequently to disturb him, and that therefore might possibly balance the advantage of my seeing his Majesty every day, or every hour of the day.

Whether you have reason to believe, that, in point of fact, any visit of any physician to his Majesty has waked his Majesty while he was sleeping, or prevented his Majesty from going to sleep?

I believe it has happened, once in particular, his being prevented from going to sleep?

What physician was it?

It was Dr. Warren.

What circumstances formed the ground of Dr. Willis's belief, that the visit which he has referred to did prevent his Majesty from going to sleep?

The pages in waiting, and the attendants, assured me, that his Majesty was going to sleep; by observations I supposed they judged from his manner of dropping his voice and breathing.

Whether, previous to Friday last, Dr. Warren and the other physician had not usually consulted you about the propriety of their

their going into his Majesty's room at the particular time when they proposed to go in?

Sometimes they have, and sometimes they have not.

At the time you was informed that his majesty had been prevented from going to sleep, did Dr. Warren consult you or your son about the propriety of his going into his Majesty's room at that time?

I told the doctor I thought it was improper at that time, because his Majesty had a very bad night, and had had just then half an hour's sleep, and the pages thought he was just falling to sleep again.

Whether his Majesty's state at that time was such as, in your judgment, to create any particular necessity for Dr. Warren's going into his Majesty's room, after you had stated to him what you have mentioned in the foregoing answer?

I knew of none—as coercion seemed to be the only thing necessary if his Majesty could not rest.

When you stated to Dr. Warren the objection before mentioned—whether you can recollect what answer Dr. Warren gave you?

When Dr. Warren went into the pages' room, Mr. Braund or Mr. Compton, the pages, desired Dr. Warren not to go in, in my presence; and he said to them, as he had done to me, that he must go in, for he was a spy upon them all?

Are you positive that Dr. Warren gave that answer?

I am very positive.

Are you positively sure that those were the very words which Dr. Warren made use of, or do you only mean to state the effect and substance of Dr. Warren's words on that occasion?

The very words; which the pages have mentioned many times since.

Will you inform the committee upon what day this conversation passed?

I cannot say, but it is down in a journal.

When did you put this down in the journal?

That day.

Did you shew that part of the journal which contains the account of this matter to the two pages that you have mentioned, or either of them.

I have not.

Whether you mean to admit and avow that you have signed reports of his majesty's state of health, proposed to be sent to St. James's which contained less favourable accounts of his Majesty's health, than you think might have been given to the public, if the whole truth had been told them?

To be sure I have signed such as I would not have sent to any relation of a patient that I was concerned for in the like situation.

Would the accounts, which you would have sent to the relations of other patients, have been more or less favourable than those which have been sent to St. James's?

More favourable in general.

Would it have been consistent with the whole truth, in his Majesty's case, to have given more favourable accounts in general?

In my opinion more consistent.

Will you state to the committee, what were your motives for giving less favourable accounts than might have been given in general, consistent with the whole truth.

As it did not affect his Majesty's health, or the cure of his Majesty, I signed them rather than have any dispute about words.

Do you mean to assert, that in your conscience you are fully persuaded that you now speak the truth, when you say, that more favourable accounts of his Majesty's state might have been given, in general, in the reports sent to St. James's?

I do assert it.

Whether you ever signed any paper, at the request of Dr. Warren, relative to the transaction of that day, in which you have been informed that Dr. Warren had prevented his Majesty from sleeping?

I did sign a paper, by the desire of Dr. Warren, and the persuasion of Sir Lucas Pepys, that Dr. Warren, as far as I knew, did not go into the room and wake his Majesty.—But I did not sign any paper, signifying that he did not go in at any time, when it was thought he might prevent his Majesty's sleeping.

Whether, at the time that you gave this paper to Dr. Warren, you informed Dr. Warren that you would not sign any paper, acknowledging that Dr. Warren had not prevented his Majesty from going to sleep, but that you would only sign a paper, stating that Dr. Warren had not waked his Majesty?

The paper was offered to me, and I refused to sign it, if it contained any thing to the purpose, that Dr. Warren did not go into his Majesty's room at a time when it was probable he might prevent his Majesty going to sleep.

By whom was that paper drawn up and tendered to you?

By Dr. Sir Lucas Pepys.

Are accounts, usually sent by you to the relations of your patients, conceived in as general terms as those which have been sent to St. James's?

I send the relations word that they are better, or worse; and mention some particulars—but then that is not often above once a fortnight.

Can you recollect, positively, whether, in the conversation which you had with Dr. Warren yesterday Sevensnight, you did, or did not, ask Dr. Warren, if a person indisposed should not say one sensible word in twenty-four hours, and the next twenty-four should say but one word, that he would not say if he was not indisposed, whether Dr. Warren would not think him better; and whether you can, or cannot, say positively, that Dr. Warren answered, No?

I can say positively, as well as I can recollect, that Dr. Warren said No, to the question so put; and I believe the by-standers remember the same.

Whether

Whether, in the same conversation, you can, or cannot, say positively, whether you did, or did not, make use of the following expression to Dr. Warren, "A certain great person will not suffer it (meaning the report) to go so, and it will fall upon you?"

It was not in the same room, or at the same time.—I did say so, or something of that sort, when the report was drawn up for me to sign, saying, at the same time, "Why should we send up what will be sent down to be altered?"

Will you explain to the committee by whose authority you so said, and what your meaning was in those words?

Prefuming that the personage would know from the pages how his Majesty had passed the day and night, I thought it was not right to send up a report which that personage would not think equal to his Majesty's present state of health.

Was that your meaning in the words which you actually used in that conversation?

Entirely so.

What did you mean by the words, "it will fall upon you?"

Sir George Baker, the day before, when his Majesty had not been quite so well, nor had so good a night, had made a more favourable report, and therefore I concluded that personage must think this report arose from Dr. Warren.

Did Dr. Warren ever inform you, that he had made a written memorandum of that conversation, or of any part of it, or desire you to explain yourself upon the subject of it?

Not that I know of—I do not remember any such thing.

Do you remember any order having been put up in the pages room, yesterday sevensnight, or upon any other day, directing that no persons should be admitted into his Majesty's room, without the knowledge of you or your son?

I wrote it, and put it up myself.

What was the reason of your writing, and putting up, such order?

Because sometimes a physician, sometimes a surgeon, or an apothecary (for there are four concerned—I mean two surgeons, and two apothecaries) did go into the room as I thought, at improper times, and disturb his Majesty;—and, as I thought it my duty to do to his Majesty what I should think it my duty to do for any private gentleman, I wrote that order.

Did you put up that order of your own authority, and for the reasons you have now mentioned; or had you any other authority for putting up that order, from any person, and whom?

The Lord Chancellor ordered me to do that which should prevent any body's going into the room without my consent, and was not pleased that I had not done it before.

Had you explained to the Chancellor your reasons for thinking that it would be proper, with respect to his Majesty's health, that such an order should be given?

I suppose

I suppose I did, in conversation, think it necessary that people should be prevented from going in and disturbing his Majesty.

Have any of the Physicians who attended his Majesty, suggested any complaints to you, that such order has prevented them from seeing his Majesty at proper times?

I do not remember that they have.

Have any other persons suggested to you that they have been prevented from seeing his Majesty?

I do not remember that they have.

Did you ever inform the physicians, that any persons had improperly intruded into his Majesty's apartment?

I do not remember that I did.

When did the Lord Chancellor give you the directions, in consequence of which you put up that paper?

I really do not remember the time; but, more than once, the Chancellor has mentioned the necessity of keeping any persons from going into his Majesty's room without some limitation.

Do you know on what grounds the Chancellor thought it necessary to repeat the necessity of this precaution?

I cannot remember; it was in conversation I suppose.

Are you quite sure you cannot recollect when, or where, you had the last conversation with the Chancellor on this subject, before you put up that order?

I am very sure I cannot fix the time, but I believe the place was my own room at Kew.

Was it before, or after, the dispute with Dr. Warren, on Friday the 2d instant?

I believe before. I do not know that I have seen the Chancellor since Friday the 2d instant.

Was it a day or two before, or long before?

I do not remember at all; nor do I remember whether it was the last time I talked with the Chancellor.

Have you any memorandum relative to this fact in your journal?

Yes.

When did you make that memorandum?

The very morning; within a quarter of an hour.

On what day was it that you wrote and put up that order?

I do not know. I believe the order itself is dated, but I am not sure. The journal will ascertain the date.

Have you kept a regular journal of occurrences since you attended his Majesty at Kew?

I have, from about the 6th or 7th day, I believe, of my attendance.

Is that order up now?

I believe so. Sir Lucas Pepys said he saw it yesterday morning.

When his Majesty read a page or two, and made very good remarks upon it, whether the books and the pages were of his Majesty's own selection, or whether they were put into his hands and pointed out by you?

Parti-

Particularly by his own selection.

Whether at the time, his Majesty read the pages aloud, to be heard by Dr. Willis, or to himself?

Aloud; nor could I know, if he did not read aloud.

Whether his Majesty has done this once, twice, or several times?

Many times in a day, as I understand; and on more days than one in the last six or seven days. I have now been absent a great part of several days.

Can you remember the last time you heard his Majesty read one, two or more pages?

Last night he did.

Did you hear him yourself last night?

Yes.

Whether you have observed, in your attendance on his Majesty, that his eye-sight is at all affected by his present malady?

Not that I know of.

Whether, when you or your son was not present, you have been informed by any of the King's physicians, surgeons, or apothecaries, that his Majesty has read with attention, and remarked with judgment, upon the objects which he had read?

I think I have heard so by Dr. Pepys; but I think I have heard from several persons that they have, at times.

What state was his Majesty in this morning?

I came away before he was up.

What state was his Majesty in going to bed last night?

Very quiet.

Whether his Majesty continued, to the time of his going to bed, to shew signs of the same attention and power of reflection, as in the instance of reading in the manner mentioned by you?

Yes, to the time I left him, which was about half past ten, and I understood from the pages, that he went to bed immediately after.

Whether any thing of a contrary nature was intermixed during the time you was with his Majesty yesterday evening?

I cannot say there did.

Whether you observe that the King's mind is in a better state in the evening before he goes to bed, or in the morning?

I think his Majesty is never so well in a morning getting up, nor for an hour afterwards.

How long was you with his Majesty yesterday evening?

I believe, in all, about one hour and a half; but I went several times out of the room.

Whether any other physician or medical person has been in the room when his Majesty has either read, or attended to reading, in your presence?

I think

I think Dr. Pepys was twice ; I am not sure whether there was any other ; I am not sure whether Dr. Gisborne was in the room last night, while his Majesty was reading.

Whether at any, and at what, distance of time after his Majesty has read, or attended to reading, in the manner described, his Majesty has conversed with you on the subjects he has either read or heard read ?

Very frequently, sometimes several hours ; for I believe his Majesty never forgets what he reads.

Whether, on any subsequent day, his Majesty has conversed with you upon what has been before read ?

Several days after ; and I think his Majesty can give as good an account of any book, or subject in a book, that he has read, either since his illness or before, as to the morality and truth of it, as most people can, I think.

Whether you have found it necessary to use coercion more or less frequently within the last fortnight, than you did in the preceding fortnight ?

Much less frequently, and not now for nearly a week.

Are you, upon recollection, sure of this fact ?

I am sure of it.

Whether the circumstance of his Majesty's having read, and attended to reading as above stated, is, in your opinion, a clear and decisive symptom either of convalescence actually approaching, or of a speedy recovery ?

I look upon it at the time as convalescence itself, and certainly a sign of his Majesty's recovery ; but I will not pretend to say how soon.

What do you consider as convalescence ?

Acting properly upon the business you are engaged in.

Whether the refreshing sleep his Majesty has had, has been natural sleep, or sleep procured by medicine or other means ?

No medicine has been ordered for the purpose, and no means but that of having his Majesty go to bed as quietly as you can.

Whether any other physician attending his Majesty has ever suggested to you the idea of pleasing or displeasing any great personage, as a motive to induce you to sign any report of his Majesty's health, more or less favourable than the actual circumstances then warranted in your opinion ?

I know not of any such.

Whether, during the favourable intervals in which you have observed his Majesty, you have remarked that his Majesty had reflected upon the nature of his illness ?

At some time I think he has, but rather seems to avoid hinting any thing of it.

Have you observed that it has depressed his spirits, so as to retard his cure ?

I cannot

I cannot suppose that it has retarded his cure or depressed his spirits, for I am not sure that he is sensible of it—He only hinted at it.

Are you sure his Majesty will recover?

It would be presumptuous for any man to say he was sure, in the case of any one whatever, or in any disorder.

What degree of confidence or hope have you upon the subject?

I have the greatest hopes, from what I have already seen of his Majesty's amendment.

Have you any doubt of his recovery?

I must doubt of every thing that has not come to pass.

Is your confidence such as to say you scarcely entertain a doubt?

It is.

Then that is now the state of your mind upon that subject?

I have already said so.

In answer to a question before put to you. "Whether, the several circumstances of his Majesty's case, which have fallen under your observation, or come to your knowledge, being duly attended to, you in your conscience think that the chance of his Majesty's recovery is greater, or less, or as good, as it was when you was examined before the former committee?" Whether you remember having answered "Much greater?"

I did say so, and I say so still.

Whether you recollect this question being put to you by the former committee, and your answer upon it?

"What hopes has Dr Willis of his Majesty's recovery?"

"I have great hopes of his Majesty's recovery. If it were any other person but his Majesty, I should scarce entertain a doubt: when his Majesty reflects upon an illness of this kind, it may depress his spirits and retard his cure, more than a common person?"

I do.

Dr. Willis having, in his former examination, declared his hopes of his Majesty's recovery to be such, that if his Majesty was a common person, he should scarce entertain a doubt; but that his Majesty's reflecting upon an illness of that kind might depress his spirits and retard his cure, more than a common person; and Dr. Willis having now stated to the committee that he has no reason to think that his Majesty's spirits have been depressed, or his cure retarded, by his having reflected upon his illness, or that he has so reflected; and having stated also to this committee, that he has, in his conscience, hopes of his Majesty's recovery, much greater than he had when he was examined before the former committee; Dr. Willis is desired to say, what that confidence is, which is much greater, with respect to his Majesty's recovery, than a state of mind which scarcely entertains a doubt?

As in the case of a common patient, the symptoms are greatly abated, and therefore greater hopes of his recovery. As to his particular station in life, from my knowledge of his Majesty's sense of religion, I have greater hopes that he will, with a proper resignation, reflect upon what it has pleased God to have afflicted him with.

Then do you mean that the committee should understand that your apprehensions, with respect to the consequences of his Majesty's reflecting upon his illness, are not the same as when you was examined before the former committee?

They are not so great, for the reason I have given.

Whether Dr. Reynolds was not by at the conversation between you and Dr. Warren, in which you used the words, "it will fall upon you?"

Possibly he might; I believe he was.

Did Dr. Reynolds join in the objection made by Dr. Warren to the proposed alteration in the report which was then in question?

Dr. Reynolds said nothing, and I have been used a good deal to stand alone in that sort of consultation.

Did you hear from Dr. Reynolds at that time, or afterwards, that Dr. Reynolds did agree to the alteration proposed?

I do not remember any thing of it.

Withdrew.

Lunæ, 12^o Die Januarii, 1789.

The Reverend Doctor FRANCIS WILLIS
again called in and examined.

WHETHER, when you signed accounts, at the desire of Dr. Warren, and by the persuasion of Sir Lucas Pepys, less favourable than the circumstances of the King's health would have warranted, you thought that difference to be a mere dispute about words?

I signed no account, that I know of, by Sir Lucas Pepys's persuasion—what I signed by his persuasion was, that Dr. Warren had not waked his Majesty.

Whether you did at any time, or at any person's desire or persuasion, sign reports less favourable than the truth would have warranted, concerning the state of his Majesty's health?

Not by any persuasion, that I know of, but in my own mind, rather than have any dispute about it.

Was it to prevent a dispute originally, or to put an end to the continuance of a dispute?

As

As it did not at all respect his Majesty's cure, and we had had disputes about words before, I did not then think it worth while to have any for the future.

Do you think that the truth or falsehood of a report, signed by the King's physicians, for the information of his subjects, to be of no more consequence than a dispute about words?

It really struck me so then, and I am not at all affected with it now.

Whether or no you have not given to her Majesty, and to the ladies who have the honour to be about her person, more exact accounts, according to your opinion, and of a more consolatory nature?

I have always given them the truth, to the best of my opinion.

Whether those accounts were in fact of a more favourable nature?

The report that was made to the public, is from the appearance of his Majesty in the morning, when the symptoms have ever been less favourable; the accounts to the ladies attending her Majesty have been frequently in the day, and therefore, taking the whole account of the 24 hours, it must appear much more favourable.

Is it true, that the report sent to St. James's does only include the state of his Majesty's health as it appears in the morning, and does not extend to the night and the preceding evening and day?

It enters into no particulars of any, except quiet or disturbed state, and sleep, and that in stating the whole together, it cannot be so particular as those given to her Majesty every hour concerning his Majesty's health, which she must be very anxious to enquire after.

Question repeated.

I think several times the report might have said, that his Majesty had passed several hours, the preceding day in many respects better than he had done the day before. As far as quiet, or not quiet, the account does include what passed in the preceding evening and day—it would not be particular enough to satisfy me whether he was either better or worse.

Whether, taken as a general report, without entering into particulars, it is more or less favourable to the state of the King's health than the truth would warrant?

To the best of my judgment, less favourable.

Is it, then, less favourable than the general result which might be drawn from all the circumstances of the different accounts which you give to the ladies attending her Majesty?

Yes, I think it is.

On what occasion, and for what purpose, did you sign the certificate relative to the transaction of that day, in which you was

informed that Dr. Warren had prevented his Majesty from sleeping?

A good-natured purpose, and on the paper being offered me to sign, and being assured that it would hurt Dr. Warren's character if I did not.

At the time of signing that certificate, did you explain to Dr. Warren, or Sir Lucas Pepys, or to any other person then present, the distinction and reservation which you have now mentioned to this Committee?

Yes, very particularly to both Dr. Warren and Sir Lucas Pepys—whether any body else was by I do not remember.

Whether you called in any of the physicians attending on his Majesty, or the surgeons or apothecaries, or any other persons than those of your own family and the pages, to be witness of the circumstances which you have described as appearing on Friday evening last?

I did not.

Whether your purpose, in excluding any persons from coming to his Majesty, except by your own permission, does not arise from an apprehension that the appearance of such persons might excite troublesome emotions?

Very certainly.

Whether you have ever consulted the registers of public hospitals, or other houses for the reception of patients labouring under this malady?

I never did. Hospitals take in patients, and call them thus indisposed. Numbers of them have been so indisposed for years perhaps, and they do not give you any account of the particular symptoms of the malady when taken into the hospital.

As Dr. Willis has said, that the circumstance of persons going into his Majesty's room may excite troublesome emotions; whether his experience enables him to say that such emotions do, or do not, in general cases, retard the cure of the patient?

In my opinion, very much.

Will you inform the committee, whether, after duly attending to every circumstance which you have related to the committee; and all other circumstances which have fallen under your observation, or have come to your knowledge, respecting his Majesty's case, and judging from facts and experience derived from your own practice, you have, or have not, greater hopes of his Majesty's recovery than when you was examined before the former committee?

Much greater hopes.

Whether the state of the weather, or the season of the year, has any effect upon patients labouring under this disorder?

The state of the weather, preventing his Majesty from taking exercise, and keeping up a proper perspiration, in my opinion, has had a tendency to retard his Majesty's recovery.

Has

Has his Majesty taken any exercise from the time of your attendance on him?

None, for about a month; before that time I think he walked out twice.

Withdrew.

Dr. GISBORNE *again called in and examined.*

Was you at Kew on Friday night last?

Yes.

Whether you saw the King in the course of that evening?

Yes.

At about what hour?

From 8 to 10, I think.

Did you play at picquet with the King?

Yes.

Did the King play in a steady recollected manner?

Moderately so.

Did he play as a man in mental health would play.

Certainly not so well as that.

Were there, in the course of play, frequent signs of the continuance of his Majesty's disorder?

I have said, in answer to a former question, that the material changes in his Majesty's situation, I think, are a better state of health, and more quietness, in his manner. I think that is an answer. There were signs of the continuance of his Majesty's disorder.

Whether you was present at any reading with his Majesty?

No; he did not read while I was present.

Have you at any time observed, that your going into his Majesty's room has been a cause of any irritation?

I think less with me than with others.

Do you know that the going in of any of his Majesty's physicians, other than Dr. Willis, or the going in of surgeons or apothecaries, has been a greater cause of irritation than the going in of Dr. Willis or his son?

I think those he sees the oftenest irritate him the least.

Was you present at the time when Dr. Willis seemed to impute a disturbance of his Majesty to the unseasonable going in of Dr. Warren?

I remember Dr. Willis's saying, he thought the going in of us together irritated his Majesty.

Were you ever present when Dr. Willis did at any time impute to Dr. Warren, his having gone in so as to prevent his Majesty's sleeping?

I do not remember his saying so.

Withdrew.

Dr.

Dr. WARREN again called in and examined.

Have you seen the King to-day ?

Yes.

In what state did you find his Majesty this morning, and what account had you of the antecedent day ?

I found his Majesty in a very irritated state this morning, and was informed that he has had, in the whole, but five hours sleep in the three last nights—that having had no sleep at all, or very little, the night before last, it was proposed to give him something last night to compose and quiet him—such a medicine was written down, but was not given him. It was proposed yesterday to carry his Majesty out to take the air. I was not informed that this was mentioned in the consultation in the morning, but I was informed by Dr. John Willis, that his Majesty's pulse was yesterday 120 in a minute—I was likewise informed that he had lain all night under coercion, and had sweated a great deal. Some prudent person advised his Majesty should not be carried out to take the air.—I have reason to think that the pulse became quieter in the course of the day—I found it this morning between 106 and 108 in a minute, and observed marks of fever on his Majesty's tongue. Dr. John Willis told me that he had promised to carry his Majesty out to-day and desired me to consider, whether the not complying with his expectations might not irritate him a great deal.—I was sorry that he had had such a promise; I was necessitated to take the least of two evils, and advised that his Majesty should not be carried out, the thermometer being 17, as I am informed, below the freezing point; and particularly, as Dr. Willis has always observed, that keeping the pores open always does his Majesty great good. His Majesty this morning suffered me to come from him with great difficulty, and could not easily be prevailed upon by me to let go my hand.

When did you see his Majesty before ?

The day before yesterday—on Saturday morning.

In what state was he then ?

His Majesty had some fever then—pulse between 80 and 90, I believe, but was very irritable; could not be kept to the same object for any space of time—tried to play at cards with me, but could not, and shewed many strong marks of his distemper.

Whether you have ever observed, upon your going in to his Majesty that his Majesty's irritation was increased by your presence, and whether he has shewn any signs of dislike to you ?

His Majesty in general receives me with eagerness—thinks he has something peculiar to say to me, and frequently proposes to confer favours upon me; he has done so this morning.

Whether his Majesty has ever shewn any signs of dislike towards you ?

Not

Not lately ; but his Majesty sometimes mixes marks of dislike with marks of favour ; but in general those of favour are greatly predominate ?

Since what time have you chiefly observed marks of disfavour ?

I do not recollect any mark of disfavour at any particular time. I was in great disfavour at Windsor—it continued for some time after his Majesty came to Kew ; it began to diminish soon after Dr. Willis came ; I gradually grew into great favour, and remain so at present, excepting that sometimes he has found fault with me for bringing him from Windsor ; but at another time told me, I did right in bringing him from Windsor ; and perhaps found some other faults, but not lately, that I know of. This is the progress, to the best of my recollection.

Have you heard that his Majesty has been irritated by the coming in of his Majesty's ordinary physicians, surgeons, or apothecaries, in a greater degree than by the coming in of Dr. Willis and his sons ?

Not that I now of ; I have never been so informed.

Whether the presence of any object, which tends to excite strong emotions in his Majesty's mind, is favourable, or otherwise, to his recovery ?

Unfavourable.

Has there, in fact, been any introduction of persons, to your knowledge, which had a tendency to excite such emotions, and to produce such irritations ?

Yes.—I should like to give an account of the first consultation we had with Dr. Willis.—The day that I introduced Dr. Willis to the King, I summoned the rest of his Majesty's physicians to a consultation at my house. It was there first settled as a principle, that quiet of body and mind were to be endeavoured to be obtained by every means possible ; and that every thing should be carefully kept from his Majesty that might tend to prevent this desirable acquisition. It was settled that a regular coercion should be made use of ; that every thing should be kept from his Majesty that was likely to excite any emotion ; that though his Majesty had not shewn any signs of an intention to injure himself, yet that it was absolutely necessary, considering the sudden impulses to which his distemper subjects people, to put every thing out of the way that could do any mischief. To all this Dr. Willis assented, yet the very next day he put a razor into his Majesty's hand, and a penknife. When I saw the Doctor next, I asked him how he could venture to do such a thing ; he said, he shuddered at what he had done. As he made use of this expression, I did not think it necessary to say much to him upon the subject. On the 12th of December, as I apprehend, the King took a walk in the garden, and some of the royal children were shewn to him ; this produced a considerable emotion, which was accompanied with acts demonstrating that emotion, as I was informed, to the best of my memory,

memory, by Mr. Keate. Notwithstanding this effect of seeing the children, Dr. Willis, the next day, introduced that person, whose great and amiable qualities we all know must necessarily make her the dearest and tenderest object of his Majesty's thoughts. The interview was short. His majesty was soon afterwards in a great state of irritation, and the strict coercion was, I believe, for the first time, actually applied that night; the blisters were put on on that night likewise. The next time that I saw Dr. Willis, I spoke to him upon this subject with some degree of sharpness, because it was contrary to my opinion, and contrary to what had been settled in consultation; for it had been settled, that whatever could be done by deliberation, should be referred to consultation; that the conduct of his Majesty in the interior room, should be left to Dr. Willis's discretion, because it did not admit of deliberation. I do not know that I convinced the Doctor that his opinion was wrong, but that the act was contrary to what was laid down in consultation could not be denied. I was always considered by the highest authority, as the first physician, and therefore thought myself particularly responsible; I thought myself obliged to look into, and to enquire after every thing that related to his Majesty: I did not suppose myself in a different situation upon the arrival of Dr. Willis, and therefore took the liberty of speaking to him with some degree of authority. I remember, when his three attendants arrived, I sent for them into the physicians room, examined them very carefully, particularly as to the temper, with which they conducted themselves towards those whom they attended, and spoke to them, as they were strangers to me, in such a manner as to let them know that their conduct would be strictly observed. My being first physician made me talk to Dr. Willis about every thing that I heard of, that did not appear to me to be quite accurate, and sometimes led to disputes. I informed the Doctor, that he was there in a double capacity, as physician and attendant on his Majesty in the interior room—that I must take my share in directing whatever related to him in the capacity of physician, though I should not interfere with respect to the conduct of his Majesty in the interior room. Not many days after this transaction I observed a book in his Majesty's hands, which affected me much, and immediately determined me to bring a charge against Dr. Willis, for what I thought bad practice. I do not mean to bring the story of this book as a fault, because I believe there was no intention to convey such a book to his Majesty: It was the play of King Lear, not in a volume of Shakespeare, but it was a corrected Lear, by Colman, and mixed with his plays. I can have no reason to think, that Dr. Willis could suspect that such a play was in that volume. His Majesty told me that Dr. Willis brought him the book, and Dr. Willis did not deny it, when I spoke to him on the subject. I do not bring this as a fault, but it was the circumstance that determined

terminated me to put in execution what I had been thinking of before, with respect to Dr. Willis; for his Majesty's observation on the book affected me strangely. I carried an account of this to the Prince of Wales, and he desired me, as he had done in every case of difficulty that had happened, from the beginning of the illness, to lay the affair before the Lord Chancellor. The Lord Chancellor went to Kew, I believe; and the result was, when I saw the Lord Chancellor, that the rules of the consultation should be strictly obeyed.—Dr. Willis has, a second time, introduced the same great and amiable person. I was informed, that some degree of irritation came on in the night, but having collected, as I thought, from several small circumstances, that the power of introducing persons to his Majesty, was to be left entirely to Dr. Willis, I did not make any complaint about it.

Can you ascertain the time of the last interview?

I cannot.

What time of the day was the first interview?

I apprehend the first interview was in the evening; and that the interview happened, not only without consulting his Majesty's physicians collectively, but that Dr. Gisborne, who was in the house that evening, and sitting in the antichamber when the introduction took place, was consulted upon the occasion.

Do you know who were present at the interview?

I think I was informed Dr. Gisborne was in some part of the house, if not all.

How soon after the interview did his Majesty's state of irritation take place?

I cannot tell; but I apprehend a little before or soon after, he went to bed: I do not know the exact time of the interview.

Had you any particular account of that interview, or of the effect which it produced at the time?

If I mistake not, Dr. Willis informed me it lasted about five minutes, every thing passed agreeably, but that something was then said, that induced Dr. Willis to put an end to the visit.

Had you any account of the circumstances or motives which led to that interview?

I had no account previous to the interview, afterwards, in talking upon the subject with Dr. Willis, he mentioned his motives, or reasons, for thinking the interview would be of service; which I could not agree to.

Whether you recollect the circumstances which attended your waiting upon his Majesty, upon a particular day, concerning which it has been since said, that you prevented his Majesty from going to sleep?

I never could accurately learn what day was fixed—I have only had a suspicion of the day. I wish to have a day fixed, that I may meet the charge.

K

Was

Was there any day on which Dr. Willis seemed to be peculiarly solicitous to prevent, or delay, your going in to the king? I do not recollect any such day.

Do you recollect any conversation you had with Dr. Willis concerning the king's being asleep, or disposed to sleep, at a time when you was going in to his Majesty?

I remember a morning when Dr. Willis said, his Majesty had had a bad night, which I myself had been acquainted with by asking the page, as I passed by the King's anti-chamber, the door of which I opened as I was going into the physicians room.—In the physicians room I mentioned that I had learnt the King had a very bad night but was then fallen asleep.—I sat down, and what discourse passed between me and Dr. Willis then, about the night, I do not know—a few words only. The doctor soon went out of the room, and when he returned, said “That the King was not sleeping, for that he spoke.”—I got up, the attending physician of the day with me, and walked towards Dr. Willis—we went together through the anti-chamber; when I arrived at the door of his Majesty's bed room, Dr. Willis said, you may, open the door, a circumstance that I do not recollect ever to have happened to me before; somebody else generally opening the door: when I opened it, I found that the room was dark. I stepped forwards very slowly; as soon as I had gone the width of the door, I was visible to his Majesty. The door being open, his Majesty immediately addressed himself very pointedly to me, saying, “I am glad to see you, and adding his wish to be released from the state he was then in, which was a state of coercion. I hesitated; went one step back to look for Dr. Willis, who was standing very near me. I said something to the Doctor, and he immediately replied, in substance, that if his Majesty complained I might comply with his request. In consequence of which it was done, by my desire. I staid but a short time with his Majesty, and, as I was walking back, I said, “I had some doubts whether the complying with his Majesty's request was not improper, for he is in a very irritated state.” Dr. Willis said, “his Majesty's will rise presently, and then we shall be able to do without coercion.”

Whether Dr. Willis expressed, at that time, any displeasure at what you had done, or represented to you any mischief that he conceived likely to ensue from it?

Not that I remember.

On what occasion did any discourse arise, concerning any certificate subscribed by Dr. Willis, relative to a transaction in which his Majesty's sleep had been prevented or interrupted?

The story was so absurd, that I never gave myself the trouble of confuting it. Sir Lucas Pepys said, the story would do me a great deal of harm. I told him, I did not value it, or some such expression. Notwithstanding which, without any intimation from me on the subject, he wrote down a paper, without my knowing what

what it was about, till he was very near the end of it, and in a minute or two more shewed it to Dr. Willis, who came into the room about that time, and said, that he had no objection to signing of it. I never considered it of any importance, nor do I now.

Do you recollect, that a paper was offered to Dr. Willis, and that he refused to sign it, if it contained any thing to the purpose, that you did not go into his Majesty room at a time that it was probable you might prevent his Majesty going to sleep?

I apprehend the doctor said something upon that subject after it was signed.

Do you recollect any thing further upon that subject?

After it was over, I said to Dr. Willis, I would not tell you that I had done you a civility this morning, while this thing was depending, and then mentioned it to him.

Do you recollect any conversation relative to your saying you was a spy upon them all?

I do, and I am very glad this circumstance was mentioned. I went upon a certain morning, immediately after my arrival at Kew, into the anti-chamber, and asked the page how his Majesty did? he replied, that he had had a very bad night, was just then fallen asleep, and you must not go in. You know, said I, that I am a spy, and must see the King; I did not mean then; and went immediately to the physicians room. This was spoken in a very good natured manner, and meant no more, than that I, from my situation, was an inspector. Will the committee please to consider, whether any man, who meant to be a spy, ever told it of himself?

Have any violent disputes ever existed between his Majesty's physicians, concerning the method of his medical treatment?

No, if you mean the medicines, so far as I know.

Have any disputes arisen between any of the physicians among themselves (the disputes with Dr. Willis excepted) concerning any part of his treatment?

Never.

Do you recollect whether Dr. Willis remonstrated against the use of blisters, as supposing them improper in this case, or dangerous?

On the contrary, the Doctor spoke highly in commendation of blisters in similar disorders.

Do you recollect any person that was present at this discourse?

I believe all the physicians can speak to his holding this language—some of them can, I certainly know—Dr. Gislborne, Sir Lucas Pepys, Dr. Reynolds, and probably Sir George Baker.

Whether, upon the whole consideration of his Majesty's case, from your own observation, and the best information you can collect, his Majesty is mended, in his particular disorder, since you were first examined before this committee?

No ; he was more disturbed part of yesterday, and the night before, from the information that I received, and is so this morning, than I usually see him.

Whether, in the report sent to St. James's, the words " tranquil," " quiet," " calm," " composed," and the like, are meant by you, so far as you have signed them, to express any amendment in the King's peculiar malady or a different state of temper, the same, or considerable symptoms of derangement existing ?

The words are not meant by me to express any amendment of the important complaint.

Has any influence, command, direction, or persuasion, been used to you, from any person whatsoever, to represent his Majesty's case in a less favourable light than it appeared to you upon your own judgment ?

Certainly-not.

When Dr. Warren was examined before this committee on Thursday last, was he acquainted at that time with the several circumstances of Dr. Willis's conduct which he has this day stated to the committee, as having excited irritation in his Majesty ?

Yes.

Whether the paper which you received from Dr. Willis, was in point of fact, according to the best of your present recollection, an acknowledgment that you had not waked his Majesty, or an acknowledgment that you had not prevented him from going to sleep ?

I must refer to the paper ; I can hardly say that I read it with accuracy—but I am ready to send the paper here.

Whether, upon that morning in which you say, that you used the words in the sense in which you have explained them, relative to your being a spy, you recollect being desired by Mr. Braund, or Mr. Compton, or Dr. Willis, not to go into his Majesty's room ?

I certainly heard no such words at the time I was going into the room ; I have already related what I heard from the page, when I first went into the anti-chamber, at my arrival at Kew.

Did you, according to the rule which on Thursday last you stated to the committee, you had made ever since Dr. Willis came, not to go in without asking the doctor or his son whether it was a proper time, ask the Doctor or his son, on that morning, whether it was a proper time for you to go in ?

No, I did not ; but, upon the doctor's observing that the King was awake, I took it for granted that this shewed that it was a proper time for my going into the King's room.

Was there any particular necessity for your going in that morning ?

The same necessity there always was, together with the circumstance of its having been a bad night.

Whether the circumstances which you have mentioned, of the increase of irritation, the quickness of the pulse, and the other symptoms,

symptoms, as having been observed or learnt by you since you were last examined by this Committee, produce any material alteration in the opinion which you have before stated to this Committee respecting the probability of his Majesty's recovery?

No.

Upon what ground was your opinion of recovery founded?

By calculation.

Withdrew.

Sir GEORGE BAKER *again called in and examined.*

When did you last see his Majesty?

Yesterday morning.

Will you inform the committee in what state his Majesty was then, and had been in the day preceding, according to your own observations, and the best information you have received?

According to the information which I received, his Majesty had passed the preceding afternoon quietly; that he had a very restless night, without any sleep; that from six o'clock to eight in the morning he was very much disturbed. When I visited his Majesty, he talked for about a minute a little consistently, but then went into a total alienation.

How long did you stay with his Majesty?

Perhaps about twenty minutes—I cannot say with accuracy.

Do you, from what you have observed on this and former occasions, believe his Majesty to have been, at any time lately, capable of reading a book, with attention and observation, for any length of time, together?

From what I have observed lately, I do not conceive that his Majesty has been capable of reading a book, for any length of time, with attention and observation.

Whether, when you observed the first symptoms of his Majesty's disorder, on the 22d of October, you communicated your apprehensions to any person?

I communicated my apprehensions by a note to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

To any other person?

No, not that night,, except to Mr. P. Hawkins.

When did you communicate your apprehensions to the Chancellor of the Exchequer?

The 22d of October.

Do you recollect the circumstances of that communication to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or any thing that passed in consequence?

The terms of the communication were, "Sir George Baker is sorry to acquaint Mr. Pitt, that he has just left his Majesty in an agitation of spirits bordering on delirium." In consequence of that communication, Mr. Pitt called on me, on Thursday the 23d of October, about two o'clock in the morning, I believe, after

I was

I was gone to bed. It was twelve o'clock when I came home, and I sent the note to Mr. Pitt immediately after.—I endeavoured to give Mr. Pitt a more full account of what I had observed.

Do you recollect being asked, in that conversation, if you thought, under the circumstances you had mentioned, it was prudent that his Majesty should be left that night without any physician, or something to that effect?

I do not recollect any thing of that kind.

Do you recollect mentioning, after some conversation on the particular circumstances of his Majesty's situation at that time, that Mr. Hawkins the surgeon was in the house, or next door, and that you thought that fully sufficient?

I do recollect that I told Mr. Pitt, that Mr. Hawkins and I had talked about bleeding his Majesty, and that we waited some time in consideration of that, before I left the house; but we found no alarm had been taken by any of the family, and that if any difficulty occurred in the night, Mr. Hawkins would naturally be sent for, and in an hour, or an hour and an half, I could come to his Majesty.

Whether you mentioned the circumstance of the King's illness to any other person near his Majesty, from that time to the time of his next attack?

I do not recollect that I did.—I must explain that; for when I went the next morning, I found his Majesty had passed a very quiet night, and was without complaint, as I communicated to Mr. Pitt by his messenger.

Then you did not conceive it necessary, or adviseable, to acquaint his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, or any other of the royal family, with the apprehensions you had conceived the night before?

I did not conceive it necessary to acquaint his Royal Highness with my apprehensions the night before, for this reason only, because I thought I had been mistaken.

Did you, for the same reason, abstain from informing her Majesty?

For the same reason.

Whether Sir George Baker observes any further degree of convalescence in his Majesty, than when he was last examined before this Committee?

No signs of convalescence.

Whether Sir George Baker, duly attending to the circumstances which he has mentioned in his examination this evening, does, or does not, in his conscience, think that the chance of his Majesty's recovery, from his present indisposition, is as good, or greater, or less, than it was when he was last examined before this Committee?

It is as good.

Can you define to the Committee the meaning of the word "convalescence?"

Some

Some degree of recovery, I suppose, it means.—It does not mean a recovery, it means something towards a recovery.

Whether, in any disorder, any degree of amendment would come under the term “convalescence?”

I think hardly.—In a fever, if your pulse was somewhat quieter to-day than yesterday, I should not say you were convalescent, but that you were better.

Is it to be understood that a person may be better, without being convalescent?

He certainly may.

When you attended his Majesty yesterday, what were the observations you made upon the state of his Majesty's pulse, and of the state of his general bodily health?

The state of the pulse was eighty-four, and as to the state of his bodily health, it was much as it had been. His Majesty is grown extremely thin.

Was there any fever, or any thing materially different in the state of his bodily health from what it had been for some time?

No, nothing materially different.

Does his Majesty's general habit, or his present disorder, make his Majesty liable to sudden and temporary variations in the state of his pulse?

I do not know the meaning of the word “habit;” but as to the present disorder, it certainly makes his Majesty liable to sudden variations of his pulse. I have counted it from 68 to 126, but not within short intervals.

Whether you consider some temporary or occasional rational discourse, a proof of the absence of this malady?

I do not.

Will you inform the committee, whether you have, or have not, known many people extremely ill of this malady, and who have never been cured, that did notwithstanding occasionally use some rational discourse?

I have hardly ever seen a person in that situation, who cannot occasionally talk rationally.

Whether you do not know persons in this malady, who in the presence of certain attendants, have abstained from those discourses and actions which would indicate the malady?

Certainly.

How many persons labouring under this malady, who had been three months ill, have recovered, under the sole care of yourself, during your life?

Not one.

Whether a patient having occasional rational conversation, while labouring under this malady, is not more favourable than when that circumstance is wanting?

I like it better, but I am not sure it is more favourable.

How

How many patients have you, in the whole course of your life, thought it proper to continue under your sole care, after they had continued three months under your sole care, indisposed in this malady?

Twenty, I believe.

How many of those patients have you cured?

Not one.

Of that number, which you suppose to be twenty, are you able to state how many of them ultimately did recover?

I do not believe any of them.

Did those persons remain under your care, to the best of your knowledge, as long as they lived?

I do not know that.

Then, do you know whether ultimately they were cured or not?

I can say nothing at all to some of them.

Can you say under what care those, to whose case you can say nothing, were put, after they ceased to be under your care?

Some of them have gone into hospitals, others into private houses.

Whether there are particular symptoms, which enable you to state it as your opinion, that patients never will be cured?

When the disorder degenerates into a state of fatuity, there are no hopes of cure.

Whether it is not common for this disorder, when it long continues without cure, to degenerate into such a state?

Very common.

What is your opinion of a calculation, which, under any management you have hitherto heard of, gives nine cures out of ten maladies, provided they are taken into hand within three months after the commencement of the disorder?

As far as I know, from my own experience, and from the experience of Dr. Batty, whom I attended formerly, such a calculation is incredible.

Whether the loss of flesh which you have mentioned, has been attended with loss of strength?

About a month ago there was no loss of strength—his Majesty has had so little exercise since, that I cannot judge now.

To what cause do you attribute the loss of flesh?

To agitation, and to perspiration, and less sleep than usual; those are all the causes that occur to me.

Whether loss of flesh, in cases of this sort, affords any argument as to the probability of recovery?

I think it affords no argument either way.

SIR GEORGE BAKER desired the two following Questions and Answers, in his Examination on Thursday last, might be read.

Q. "Has Sir George Baker attended his Majesty only, or has he been employed in attending the Royal Family?"

A. "Both

A. "Both his Majesty, and also the Royal Family; I mean the family at Windsor and at Kew."

Q. "Is Sir George Baker now employed to attend on the Royal Family?"

A. "Only the King—not the Royal Family."

Sir GEORGE BARKER then desired that his answer to the first of those questions might stand as follows:

"Both his Majesty and the Queen, and the Royal Family residing with their Majesties."

And that his answer to the second question might stand as follows:

"Not on the Royal Family."

Do you know any instance of Dr. Warren, or any other physician, by improper interruption, disturbing his Majesty's rest, or preventing his going to sleep?

I know no such instance.

Sir George Baker having said, in answer to a question put to him, That, duly attending to the several circumstances which he has mentioned in his examination this evening, he does in his conscience think, that the chance of his Majesty's recovery is as good as when he was last examined before this committee—and several questions having been addressed to, and several answers given by him, since he so declared his opinion,—does he continue in his conscience, to hold the same opinion, due regard being had to the several circumstances referred to in such questions and answers?

I am of the same opinion that I was two hours ago.

Withdrew.

Sir LUCAS PEPYS *again called in and examined.*

WHETHER you know any instance of Dr. Warren, or any other physician, by improper interruption disturbing his Majesty's rest, or preventing him from going to sleep?

No; no instances.

When did you see the King last?

I came from him this morning.

In what state did you leave his Majesty?

Rather quieter than he was last night; very far from being so calm as I have seen him,

Have there been within the last three days, great signs of fever and irritation?

Very considerable.

How has his Majesty been with respect to sleep within that time?

From the report of the pages, who have sat up for the last three nights, it appears that his Majesty has not had above five or six hours sleep.

A Paper of which the following is a copy, was then shewn to
SIR LUCAS PEPYS:

" Kew House, December 25, 1788.

" A malicious report having been industriously circulated, that
" Dr. Warren had gone into his Majesty's Bed-chamber, contra-
" ry to the desire of Dr. Willis, and the pages, and then and
" there, in a violent manner disturbed his Majesty out of his sleep,
" in consequence of which he became more than usually disturb-
" ed—This is to certify, that the whole of the above report is
" not true, and is merely founded in malice.

" Thursday morning.

" F. WILLIS."

This paper was written by me, and signed by Dr. Willis, upon
the 25th of December last.

What share had Dr. Warren in procuring the drawing up or
persuading the signature of this paper?

Having heard frequently of the report mentioned in this paper,
and conceiving it to be very injurious to his character, without
any communication with Dr. Warren on the subject, and whilst
Dr. Warren and Dr. Willis were talking in the room, I hastily
wrote this paper, wishing thereby to put an end to all altercation.
I shewed it Dr. Warren, who immediately presented it to Dr.
Willis; and I told Dr. Willis I conceived he could have no ob-
jection to sign his name in contradiction to such a malicious report;
this he really did, and Dr. Warren thanked him for having so
done.—Nothing more passed on the subject.

Did Dr. Willis, at the time, make a distinction between pre-
venting sleep, and waking from sleep; refusing to give any certi-
ficate with regard to the preventing, but consenting to this certi-
ficate with regard to the waking—or any distinctions to that effect?

No such distinction was made to me, nor were there any more
words, to the best of my recollection, passed on the subject.
What they might say, I do not know, for I was writing.

Did you desire Dr. Willis to give a certificate to the former ef-
fect, which he refused?

No, I never asked him any more questions on the subject.

Was not this certificate to meet the particular charges which
you had heard were circulated against Dr. Warren?

Yes.

Will you inform the committee, whether the report that had
been circulated was, to the best of your information, that Dr.
Warren had, in a violent manner, disturbed his Majesty out of
his sleep, or, that he had prevented him from going to sleep?

I wished, by the certificate, to meet the report of Dr. Warren's
having disturbed his Majesty while sleeping, which was the report
that was circulated.

Withdrew.

Martins,

Martis, 13^o Die Januarii 1789.

Rev. Doctor FRANCIS WILLIS *again called in and examined.*

DO you remember the time when you were first introduced to attend on his Majesty?

About Friday five or six weeks.

Do you remember at that time a general consultation of all the physicians, at which you was present?

Yes.

Was the object of that consultation to settle the general rules, upon which his Majesty's case was to be conducted?

Concerning medicines in particular.

Was it agreed, at that time, to keep out of the way of his Majesty every thing by which a person, under his distemper, might, from sudden impulse, be induced to injure himself?

I do not remember one word about it: things of that sort, I understood, were left to me to judge at the moment.

Do you remember your having put a razor and penknife into the hands of his Majesty, the day after the consultation?

His Majesty had not been shaved for a long while, perhaps a fortnight, or three weeks; and the person that had been used to shave him, could not complete the parts of his upper and under lips; and, being confident, from the professions and humour of his Majesty at that moment, I suffered his Majesty to shave his lips himself; and then he desired he might have his whole face lathered, that he might just run it over with a razor; and he did so in a very calm manner. His nails also wanted cutting very much! and upon his assurance, and upon my confidence in his looks, I suffered him to cut his own nails with a penknife while I stood by him.—It is necessary for a physician, especially in such cases, to be able to judge, at the moment, whether he can confide in the professions of his patient; and I never was disappointed in my opinion, whether the professions of the patient were to be relied on or no.

After having attended a patient for so short a time, as you then had his Majesty, have you suffered them to shave themselves, or cut their own nails?

I do not know particularly as to that; but I have trusted them with a knife and fork, at as early a time, I believe.

As both these operations might have been performed by other people, was there any particular reason which induced you to suffer his Majesty to do them himself?

The reason was, the great uneasiness and distress his Majesty shewed from the razor going over his lips, by the length of the hair, and the person not being able to accomplish it.

Had you any conversation soon after, with Dr. Warren, on the subject of that transaction?

I believe I had, a day or two after.

What were the particulars of that conversation?

I do not know, any further than that the Doctor shewed his surprise that I had suffered his Majesty to perform those two operations himself;—upon which I told the Doctor as I have now mentioned, I believe—that, at the moment, I was sure those instruments were very safe in his Majesty's hands; but that it had a bad effect, because his Majesty imagined, from thence, that he might have the liberty of doing other things?

Upon Dr. Warren's expressing his surprise to you, did you say to Dr. Warren, that you shuddered at what you had done?

I do not remember any thing of it.

At the consultation, to which you have already referred, was it not a principle settled among the physicians, that quiet of body and mind were to be endeavoured to be obtained by every means possible?

I believe it was; but I do not remember any particulars of it.

Do you recollect it having been settled at such consultation, that every thing should be kept from his Majesty that was likely to excite any emotion?

I do not remember any; but understood that, as I was in the House for that particular occasion, I was to use my own discretion.

Do you recollect his Majesty to have taken a walk in the garden at Kew, on a particular day, early in the month of December?

I think his Majesty walked out two days successively, early in December.

Was it about the 12th of December?

Infancy it was there or thereabouts; he walked out but twice.

On either of those days, did his Majesty see any of the royal children in the course of his walk?

When he came by the house the first day, he looked up at the windows where the princesses are generally, and complained very heavily that they would not so much as shew themselves to him. In consequence of which, the next day, I did desire that they should appear, and myself stood at the window, with two of the princesses, when his Majesty was coming by; and his Majesty shewed extravagant joy at the sight of them, though he said, his eyes did not suffer him to see the Princess Amelia so well as he could wish.

How long were the princesses in his Majesty's sight?

Not many seconds.

Do you think that this circumstance, of having seen those princesses was attended with any material bad consequences in his Majesty's state?

I think

I think quite the contrary.

Do you, or do you not, think that in the conduct of such a cure as that of his Majesty's disorder, it is of use that the patients should be gradually, or at times, accustomed to scenes of an interesting nature, such as that you have described?

I am very sure that such occurrences can scarce be too frequent, as it comforts the patient to think that he is with his family, and that they are affectionate to him; and upon enquiries of patients who have been cured of the same indisposition, they have always mentioned those occurrences having given them the greatest comfort, and, as they thought, helped very much towards their recovery.

Is it your opinion, that suffering his Majesty to continue anxious for a sight of his children would have been attended with more, or less, inconvenience than the irritation which the seeing of them might occasion?

There would have been more inconvenience in his not seeing them, from his anxiety; for the irritation occasioned by a patient seeing his friends or relations is entirely overbalanced by the softening him into tears, which ever leads to amendment.

Do you consider the observing those emotions, which may naturally take place at the sight of relations or friends, as furnishing grounds of judging with regard to the state of the disorder, or the probability of cure?

Yes, it is a favourable symptom, if the patient shews affection, instead of aversion; which latter is very often the case, in those who are not so likely to recover.

Soon after the occurrence which you have related, had his Majesty an interview with the Queen?

I believe in the evening of that day, or the day after—I think so. How long did that interview last?

A quarter of an hour.

Are you of opinion that this interview was attended with any prejudicial consequences, or the reverse?

I can form no opinion whether it was the one or the other, because that night two blisters were applied to his Majesty's legs, which, from the consequence of them afterwards, I believe, were the occasion of his having a very bad night, and that his having seen her Majesty had no concern in it; but that is mere opinion.

Are these the same blisters which you have already mentioned before this committee?

Yes;—there have been no other since I came.

Are you of opinion, that the application of blisters is a salutary remedy in disorders of that nature?

I have had the greatest reason to think so, if they were not applied upon or near the head.

Was you of opinion that the blisters applied to his Majesty's legs, on the evening of the day when he saw the Queen, was a proper measure?

I thought

I thought so at that time, as I understood two blisters, that had been applied at Windsor, did not shew that they increased his Majesty's irritability.

Was it settled at a consultation that those blisters should be applied?

Yes.

Was there a second interview with the Queen?

Yes.

When was that?

It was while his Majesty's legs were bad from the blisters, before they were at all well.

Were there any bad effects produced from that interview?

I do not know that there were, nor do I know that there were any good, because of the blisters irritating him.

Do you recollect any particular circumstance which led you in addition to your general reasoning upon the subject, to wish the King to have an interview with some of his family.

No other than from his great uneasiness and desire to see them—and the necessity I think there is to have such occurrences very frequently.

Do you recollect any thing of the King having seen the youngest princess before he saw the Queen?

Yes.

When?

Just before he first saw the Queen.

Did any thing arise from that circumstance, which more particularly led to the interview with the Queen?

He persuaded the princess to promise him that she would fetch the Queen.

Did he give any signs of much anxiety upon the subject of that request being complied with?

Very great—infomuch that the meeting was extremely moving.

Do you recollect, among other books, to have put the tragedy of King Lear into the hands of the King?

His Majesty asked me to give him the tragedy of King Lear. I told him it was improper. He then desired to have Foote's plays, and Coleman's. I did not know that Coleman had put out an edition of King Lear, indeed I had never read Coleman's works, and when I told it to the Chancellor, he told me he was as ignorant of it as I was; and when I was charged by Dr. Warren for giving his Majesty it, I thought I had not done it, and positively said I had not; and, it being the same day that Dr. Warren had charged me, in a most extraordinary manner, for writing what I had not, and doing with a political view what I did not, I really thought that the Doctor had charged me as falsely with the one as in the other; and was very much surprised, when I went into the pages room, to see that King Lear was, I think, in the third volume of Coleman's works. But be that as it may, it

was

was of no consequence, for at that time his Majesty could not read three words in any book.

Was his Majesty in a very irritated state yesterday morning?

I just saw his Majesty—I left him about half past seven o'clock, and he was not so then. His Majesty took hold of my hand, and said, I should not go London; and complained of my having left him so much in the last week.

At that time did you feel his Majesty's pulse?

I did.

In what state was it?

An irritated pulse—considerably too quick.

Had the King a considerable fever upon him?

A nervous fever, from irritability, more than from any other cause, in my opinion.

Was his tongue much affected?

Yes, his tongue looked white;—but there are appearances of an affection of the nerves from the tongue, that is rather of a different nature from that which is from fever alone—in short, what appears in hysterical cases.

How long were you with his Majesty?

About a minute; not more.

Had you proposed to carry out his Majesty to take the air yesterday, or the day before?

I had an intention both days, because such appearances of fever as I judged his Majesty's to be, are to be removed by amusement, more perhaps than by any thing else.

Had his Majesty been in a great perspiration the night before?

On the Saturday night he had; and that was the only reason that determined me not to take his Majesty out.

What physician attended on Sunday morning at Kew?

Sir George Baker, I think.

Did Sir George Baker and you agree upon the impropriety of taking his Majesty abroad after such a perspiration?

I don't remember that we said any thing about it.

At what time of the day did you determine against his Majesty's going out?

I believe it was about two o'clock, but I am not sure.

Did you see his Majesty this morning?

I did not—I saw one of the pages.

Was you at Kew time enough to see him last night?

I saw him go to bed, and a long while before.—He went to bed extremely quiet and sensible, while I was in the room last night—went to sleep a quarter past eleven, and waked a quarter before seven, as I understand from the page and one of the attendants.

After you had permitted the King the use of a razor and pen-knife, what were the bad effects that you apprehended from his thinking that he had a right to do other things?

His

His Majesty took it ill that I would not let him go up stairs to see his family, and many other things, which I found it would not be prudent to do.

Whether you have since continued to indulge his Majesty in the use of the razor and the penknife?

Never since, either of them, for the reason I have already given. Is it only for fear he should ask for other liberties, which you think it proper to refuse him?

Yes.

Do you think that the expectation of the liberties which the King might call for, would be of more danger to him than the use of razors or penknives?

To be sure, because the refusal would irritate him much, and increase his disorder.

Whether you refuse to the King all indulgences which may be safely given, lest he should demand those that ought to be refused?

I do a great many that may be safely given.

Will you inform the Committee, whether you have frequently indulged the King in the view of the royal children, since the interview you mention?

Not once.

Will you inform the Committee, whether, after the first interview with the Queen, there was not a remonstrance made to you upon the impropriety of that step?

Yes there was.

Was it only made to you by the physicians, or carried further?

Only by the physicians, as I know of.—I had a conversation with the Chancellor about it, and I told the Chancellor, as I did the physicians, that I imagined that those things were left to my judgment, and to be done or not, as it appeared best at the present moment.

Did the Chancellor encourage you in the use of that discretion, without consultation with the physicians attending on his Majesty?

The Chancellor told me that I should consult the other physicians as much as I could, but that I was to follow my own line, and do as I had been used to do with patients at home.

Whether any other physician besides Dr. Warren, expressed his disapprobation of your indulging the King in the use of sharp instruments, and in affecting interviews?

I do not know any, except Dr. Warren—I do not remember.

Were any of the rest acquainted with those circumstances?

Dr. Gisborne was present at the first interview with her Majesty.

How came the indulgence of the King in the sight of two of the Princesses at the window to be so short, when the King expressed so much satisfaction in it?

I can give no particular reason for it: his Majesty saw them as he passed along, and made a little stop; the window was not open, and they were up stairs.

What

What was the occasion of the interview with the Princess Amelia?

His Majesty's earnest desire, and the hope that it might have some good effect.

Whether the Princess Amelia was brought into the King's presence, or only shewn at a window?

I led the Princess Amelia into the room myself.

What happened on the occasion?

He was extremely fond of her, and shewed the greatest mark of parental affection I ever saw.

Did his Majesty suffer her to depart willingly?

Very willingly, on condition that she brought the Queen to his Majesty.

What was the cause why the interview with the Queen did not continue longer than the time you have stated?

Because his Majesty gave me his word it should be but for fifteen minutes.

Are you quite sure that his Majesty's discourse did not grow more disordered towards the end of that meeting, than it had been at the beginning.

I was not a judge, because his Majesty spoke in German several sentences, which I did not understand; but his Majesty took leave of the Queen and Princess very properly.

For what reason, that night, was it thought proper, on consultation, to have recourse to blisters, for the first time since your arrival?

To make a revulsion.

What occasion was there that day more than before, to have recourse to that operation?

It was determined by us in the morning to put them on that night.

Whether the King grew more composed before those blisters were put on?

I do not remember any thing about it.

Whether, after the interview with the Queen, the physicians did not remonstrate against such interviews?

I believe they might.

Did you, at that time, tell them that you were resolved to permit such interviews at your discretion?

I told them, I believe, that I was sent for there in order to make use of my own discretion, and that they could not think themselves proper judges about it.

At what hour were the blisters put on, after the first interview?

About ten o'clock at night.

Was actual coercion used on that night?

I do not remember.

Can you recollect?

I cannot.—I believe it might be the next day, or the next night;

night ; I am not sure ; it was about that time, and was the very first time it was used, I believe.

Whether you declared your intention in persisting in the grant of such indulgencies when you should think proper ?

I certainly did, by implication.

Did you give any notice, or consult any physician, about the second interview with the Queen ?

I do not remember.

When was the time of the second interview with the Queen ?

I do not recollect.

Have you indulged the King with any further interview with her Majesty ?

Only on the times that have been mentioned.

Has the King been indulged with a view of his brothers or sons ?

No.

Whether any, and what conversation, gave rise to the king's desire of having the tragedy of King Lear put into his hands ?

I do not know of any ; I never before read King Lear in my life.

Why did you represent it as improper to give the tragedy of King Lear to the king ?

Because I did understand the character of King Lear, though I had not read it.

Were any of the king's physicians, surgeons, or apothecaries present, when the king called for Foot's or Colman's plays ?

I do not remember.

Whether the king did actually read any part, however small, of Colman's tragedy of King Lear ?

I had said before that I had not known it was there—I did not see him read it at any time.

Did you hear him refer to it ?

I did not.

On the whole of your experience, for near thirty years, do you or do you not, think, that in the management of persons in his Majesty's situation, though a general line of conduct may be laid down, yet that much good may result from occasional deviations from it, when made at the discretion and under the constant observation of a physician who is thoroughly conversant with this species of complaint ?

Very certainly.

Do you think that such deviations not being allowed to such physicians may greatly retard the cure ?

I am very much of that opinion.

Do you recollect whether you ever told Dr. Warren previous to yesterday morning, that his Majesty had asked for the play of King Lear, and that you had refused to comply with the request, as improper, before you brought his Majesty the volume of Colman's play ?

I really do not remember.

Dr. Willis

Dr. Willis having informed the committee, that from his knowledge of his Majesty's sense of religion, he has greater hopes that he will, with a proper resignation, reflect upon what it has pleased God to have afflicted him with—whether Dr. Willis grounds those hopes upon observing that his Majesty is not irritated by being sensible of his situation ?

I do not understand the question.

Have you observed that the king has appeared at all sensible of his situation ?

Very much so ; and more particularly lately, within these few days.

What time do you mean by a few days ?

Within this week—but more so last night.

How come you now to be enabled to answer positively, on being asked whether his Majesty appeared sensible of his situation, that he has been very much so within this week past, when on Saturday last you said you was not sure that he had been sensible of it ?

By his situation now, I mean both his Majesty's situation as King, and his indisposition, taken together ;—complaining of his being confined in one room, when he has other places that he might be in !—not to dine where he lies ;—and that he should be deemed a person so indisposed, as not to be suffered to be his own master !—all which prevented him, his Majesty told me last night, from ever thinking of taking the reigns of government.

Is the committee to understand from you, that those sort of complaints have been made by his Majesty only once, or frequently ?

They have been made vaguely frequently, but not to make one understand that he was sensible of his indisposition, and the consequence of it.

Then in point of fact, Dr. Willis, till last night, had no reasonable ground to attribute any symptoms in his Majesty's disorder to his recollection of his situation ?

I do not attribute any of his symptoms to his recollection of his disorder ; I do not remember that I ever did.

Have his Majesty's spirits appeared depressed or irritated by this consciousness, if in point of fact, it did exist ?

Not at all, as I know of ; they are rather the consequences of irritation, than the cause of them.

Do you remember to have written, on the 5th of this month, a letter containing the following paragraph : “ His Majesty can talk of and be kept to any subject in general much better than heretofore ; but is more subject to gusts of passion upon any trifling contradiction, unless I or my son are present ; and this I rather attribute to his Majesty's being more sensible of himself and situation ?

Yes, I did write it, and think it.

To whom was that letter written ?

M 2

I fancy

I fancy it was to the Prince of Wales.

Did that letter commence by saying, "I am sorry I cannot give your Royal Highness so good an account this morning as I gave you when I last did myself the honour to write to your Royal Highness;" and then did the paragraph last quoted follow?

It did; the reason of that letter commencing with those words was, his Majesty having had a very bad night, which the report to his Royal Highness would plainly shew; but which bad night did not at all prove that I had a worse opinion of his Majesty's recovery, though I could not give so favourable an account as I had some days before, when his Majesty had had two or three very good nights; and I thought it necessary to give his Royal Highness my opinion of his Majesty's state separate from his bad night.

Then you, in saying that his Majesty could talk of and be kept to any subject in general much better, referred to his Majesty's general situation?

To his situation at that time, because the exacerbations of such disorders do not weaken in general the understanding in those cases: but as the patient recovers, we often find the understanding is strengthened after each, especially if the time betwixt each is lengthened: which has been the case of his Majesty for this last three weeks or a month, I think; for though his Majesty has gusts of passion, and is easily irritated, yet they are of very short duration, in comparison to what they were.

Were those gusts of passion of shorter duration than they had been, when you wrote this letter to the Prince, on the 5th of January?

Very much so.

Were they more or less frequent at that time?

According as the people who were with him understood how to speak to him, they were more or less frequent.

But, in point of fact, were they more or less frequent?

Less frequent I think, too.

Dr. Willis having taken a distinction with regard to his signing the accounts sent to St. James's—will he inform the Committee whether he does not hold himself responsible for the truth of the accounts he sends to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, which he signs alone, and that they shall contain the real state of the King's situation?

To be sure.

Will you inform the Committee why you informed his Royal Highness, on the 5th of January, that his Majesty was more subject to gusts of passion upon any trifling contradiction, unless you or your son was present at that time, than before—when you now inform the Committee that those gusts of passion were then less frequent than they had been.

His Majesty began to feel himself more in his own situation as King, and could not bear to be contradicted so well by either
pages

pages or attendants, and consequently would break out in gusts of passion upon things that they did for him, perhaps not in a manner that his Majesty thought became them, and which they had used themselves to when his Majesty was not so well.

Is it to this that you attribute the gusts of passion being then more frequent, as described?

Yes—and it required a more delicate behaviour than it had done before.

Then your having observed those circumstances, namely the frequent gusts of passion, in his Majesty, and that his Majesty felt himself more in his own situation as King, so as to make a more delicate behaviour necessary to him; and having on the 5th of January, informed his Royal Highness that you attributed such gusts of passion to his Majesty being more sensible of himself and situation;—you will now inform the committee why you declared yourself, on Saturday last, not to be sure that his Majesty had been sensible of the nature of his illness; and why you now have informed the committee that it has been within this week only, and more particularly last night, that you have perceived such symptoms or effects?

His situation, as king, is different from the nature of his illness.

Do you not mean, when you state the King in that letter to be more sensible of himself and situation that he was sensible both of his being King, and of the circumstances which must bring to his mind his malady?

No: I mean being King, and being confined in a room.

Then have you, or have you not, seen in the King any symptoms of his recollection of his malady?

I think I did, particularly last night.

Did you never before last night?

I may have said that I thought I had, but I am not sure.

Whether the conversation you had with his Majesty last night has not now led you to be more certain that, on former occasions, his Majesty was, in fact, sensible of the nature of his illness, though, at the time, that circumstance was only vaguely hinted at by his Majesty, or conjectured by you?

Much more so.

Is the committee to understand that, previous to the 5th of January, the exacerbations of his Majesty's disorder were more strong and more frequent, though his Majesty might become, at that time, from the reason you have already given, more subject to particular gusts of passion upon any trifling contradiction, unless you or your son was present?

Yes, certainly.

Do you mean to say, that the observation you made on his Majesty last night, could at all have affected any opinion you formed, or any communication you made, on the 5th instant.

Not at all.

Why

Why you, having observed, as you state in your letter to his royal highness on the 5th instant that you did, that his Majesty's frequent gusts of passion were to be attributed to his Majesty being more sensible of himself and situation—why you informed the committee, on Saturday last, that you had now less apprehensions with respect to the consequences of his Majesty's reflecting upon his illness, than when you was examined before the former committee?

Because I was then better acquainted with his Majesty's principles, and notions of religion, than I was before.

Withdrew.

EXAMINATION *relative to Doctor* JOHN WILLIS:

Veneris, 9^o. Die Januarii, 1789.

Rev. Dr. FRANCIS WILLIS *again called in and asked.*

WHETHER your son, Dr. John Willis, is a physician?

He took his degrees at Edinburgh about thirteen or fourteen years ago—has practised physic ever since—he was bred up at Oxford—studied physic there first, and was afterwards four or five years at Edinburgh.

How long has he attended his Majesty?

He came the Thursday after I came—I came on the Friday.

Has he been consulted as a physician since he has attended at Kew?

As to the medicines—and, though he has not signed the report, always was consulted about it?

Was Dr. John Willis ever consulted by the other physicians in forming any prescription for medicine to be given to his Majesty?

I think I answered before that he was.

Has he ever signed his name to any one prescription?

Several.

For his Majesty?

I think so—am pretty sure so—there never was any prescription without his being there.

Then you understand that all the other physicians consider Dr. John Willis, and act with him, as a physician attending on his Majesty, and not an assistant to you in the care of the King?

I understand as a physician.

Why has Dr. John Willis never signed the Report sent to St. James's?

I never

I never knew any reason.

By whose direction was Dr. John Willis summoned to attend his Majesty?

I understood by the Privy Council—Lord Sydney sent the letter.

When was the letter sent?

I believe it was on the Monday or Sunday before he came.

Who informed you that the Privy Council sent for your son?

Lord Sydney sent the messenger—that is all I know.

To whom was the letter sent?

To Dr. John Willis.

Whether you know that it was at the desire of the physicians the letter was sent, or at whose desire?

I really do not know—but I believe Dr. Warren first said that I could not attend enough, that it would be too much for me.

Whether you sign the prescriptions?

I sign them, or give my consent to the physician that writes to sign my name.

When Dr. Warren mentioned that your son should be called on, as you could not attend enough, did you understand that Dr. Warren meant as an assistant, or as a physician?

As a physician, as well as any thing else—not as an assistant distinguished from a physician.

Do you consider your son as in any degree responsible for the medicines administered to his Majesty?

I imagine so,

Withdrew.

Dr. RICHARD WARREN *again called in and examined.*

Whether you consider Dr. John Willis as attending his Majesty in the character of a physician, or as an assistant to Dr. Willis in the care and management of his Majesty?

I have always considered him as an assistant.

Do you consult with Dr. John Willis, as a physician, before you prescribe for his Majesty?

Dr. John Willis is generally, I believe I may say almost always, present at the consultations; we enquire of him how the King has passed his time—when medicines are proposed, Dr. John Willis has often spoke upon the subject of them, and attention has been paid to what he said—yet, at the same time, I considered him only as an *amicus curiæ*.

Do you not make the same sort of enquiries from the other four medical gentlemen, who are in attendance on his Majesty?

Yes; but they do not talk about medicines.

Do you consider Dr. John Willis as responsible with you in the prescriptions and physical treatment of the King?

I think

I think not.

Does Dr. John Willis sign those prescriptions with you?

It is usual for the writer of the prescriptions to put down the initials of the names of the consulted physicians—I believe when I have written the prescription, I have never put his name down.

In that case then, as far as you are concerned, Dr. John Willis is not responsible for the medicines administered?

No.

Does Dr. John Willis sign the report sent to St. James's?

No.

If he had acted, and had been consulted, and considered as a physician attending on his Majesty, would it not have been right and necessary that he should have taken his share of the responsibility in both or either of those respects?

It would certainly be right that he should.

Has Dr. Willis, the father, signed the prescriptions, and from what time?

I apprehend the father's name is put down to the prescriptions from the time that he came.

When did he subscribe his name to the reports?

I do not exactly know the time; it is easily seen.

Did he desire so to do?

I understand from the Chancellor that he did.

Have the other physicians, or any of them, subscribed the initials of Dr. John Willis's name to prescriptions for his Majesty?

I do not know—but I have been told that some of them have.

Do you consider Dr. John Willis more in the character of a physician, with respect to his situation about the King, than the four other medical gentlemen attending his Majesty, namely, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Keate, Mr. Dundas, and Mr. Battiscombe?

More respect is due and paid to him, because he has taken a degree.

But with respect to his situation about the King, do you act with him, or consider him more in the light of a physician than those four gentlemen?

No.

Would not the same attention have been paid to any other physician then present, who had seen his Majesty, though not at all attending as a physician to his Majesty?

Provided there was no impertinence in his being there.

If, after Dr. John Willis conversed with Dr. Warren upon the subject of the medicines for his Majesty, Dr. John Willis had desired Dr. Warren, when he was writing the prescription, to put the initials of Dr. John Willis to such prescription, or to permit him, Dr. John Willis, to do so, Dr. Warren, knowing that Dr. John Willis had been educated at Oxford, and had taken

taken a doctor's degree at Edinburgh, and had practised physic for thirteen or fourteen years since he took that degree, would have made the same objection to such initials, or permitting them to be added to the prescription, as he would have done if the surgeons and apothecaries, all or any of them, had made the same request with respect to their own initials?

The question must have been, whether Dr. John Willis was authorized to act there as a physician.

Considering the circumstances of Dr. John Willis's attendance upon his Majesty, and that he is a physician who has been educated, and has taken a degree, in the manner mentioned in the last question—if Dr. John Willis had made such a request with respect to his initials, should Dr. Warren have thought it an impertinent request?

Certainly—unless he was considered as responsible for the medicines.

Then does Dr. Warren consider the other physicians, if any, who have put the initials, or permitted the initials of Dr. John Willis to be put, to their prescriptions, has having done, or suffered to be done, an improper act, considering the circumstances under which Dr. John Willis attends his Majesty?

I can only answer for my own conduct—I think I should not be called upon to judge of others.

If Dr. Warren had permitted the initials of Dr. John Willis to be put to a prescription, does he think (answering for his own conduct, if it had been such) that he would have done an improper act, considering the circumstances under which Dr. John Willis attends his Majesty?

I should never consider it as a permission, unless I had been asked whether his initials should be put down; because they are often written by the prescribing physician after the prescription has been agreed to, and the initials not particularly examined.

Whether, if his permission had been asked, when a prescription was written by himself or any other of his Majesty's physicians, to put the initials of Dr. John Willis to such prescription, together with his own name; and if he had given that permission, Dr. Warren, answering for his own conduct, would have thought he had done an improper act in giving his permission, considering the circumstances under which Dr. John Willis attends his Majesty, and considering the circumstance of his education at Oxford, the fact of his having taken the degree of doctor of physic at Edinburgh, and the fact of his having practised as a physician for thirteen or fourteen years past?

The propriety of putting the initials down must depend upon the responsibility of the person.

Whether, the several circumstances mentioned in the foregoing questions being duly attended to, if Dr. John Willis had this

morning asked Dr. Warren's permission to put his initials to a prescription, Dr. Warren would this morning have refused to give such permission?

Degrees in physic give no authority to practise in London, or within seven miles of London—there is no other qualification than that of being a fellow or licentiate of the College of Physicians—If the circumstance of being about his Majesty induced me to think him responsible for the medicines, I should have put the initials down.

In point of fact, due attention being paid to all the circumstances relative to Dr. John Willis's attendance upon his Majesty, would Dr. Warren this morning have refused to permit the initials of Dr. John Willis to be put to a prescription, upon the conviction of his (Dr. Warren's) mind that those circumstances, do not make him responsible in such a degree as to make it sufficiently proper that those initials should be put; and whether the fact of his Majesty's being at Kew would induce Dr. Warren to form an opinion upon the propriety of giving such permission, different from the opinion which he might have on such propriety if his Majesty was at Windsor?

The rule to guide me, whether the initial of a person attending his Majesty should be put down to a prescription, must be my being informed that that person is put about the King by proper authority.

Has Dr. Warren, in point of fact, written many of the prescriptions for his Majesty, and subscribed the initials of the other physicians?

I have not written many since his Majesty came to Kew; but when I have written, I have put down the initials of the physicians present.

Whether you know that a letter was sent by Lord Sydney to bring Dr. John Willis to town?

I know of no such thing as a letter written by Lord Sydney.

Do you know in what manner Dr. John Willis was sent for to attend the King?

I consulted the Chancellor and Mr. Pitt on the propriety of Dr. Willis's servants being sent for—They were sent for with the consent of the Chancellor and Mr. Pitt—Dr. Willis wrote the letter, and, I believe, I advised him to send for his son to assist him.

Has any other of the persons then sent for up been present at a consultation, and given an opinion respecting the medicines?

No.

Whether Dr. Warren did not know that there was other approbation, besides the Chancellor and Mr. Pitt, for sending for Dr. Willis's servants?

Not for sending for them, but for making use of them afterwards.

What

What other approbation was there for making use of them ?

I understood that it was communicated to Dr. Willis—the Doctor told me he had authority to make use of those servants.

Does Dr. Warren apprehend that Dr. John Willis's attendance was with the knowledge or approbation of any of the Royal Family ?

I could not think otherways, but I never was told so.

Did Dr. Warren conceive that the approbation of any of the Royal Family given to the attendance of Dr. John Willis, was given as a physician, or as the principal person to direct the servants of Dr. Willis ?

Not as a physician, but as assistant to his father.

On what grounds does Dr. Warren entertain that opinion ?

Because, upon enquiry, soon after his arrival, when a prescription was written, whether Dr. John Willis's name was to be put to it, he declined it.

By whom, and of whom, was that enquiry made ?

By one of the physicians asking, at a morning consultation, whether Dr. John Willis's name was to be put to it.

Did Dr. John Willis decline ?

Yes.

Were any observations made upon it by any one else ?

I believe not.

Had Dr. John Willis not declined to sign the prescription, should you have any objection ?

I should then have supposed that he had authority to act as a physician.

Dr. Warren having said, that he believes that other physicians have put Dr. John Willis's initials to prescriptions, should he, in that case, conclude that Dr. John Willis has authority to attend his Majesty ?

Dr. Warren can only answer for the motives of his own conduct.

Whether, when you recommended it to his Majesty's ministers to send for Dr. John Willis, you intended to recommend it to them to send for him in the character of an additional consulting physician, or as an assistant to his father in the care and management of the King ?

I did not recommend it to ministers to send for Dr. John Willis at all, that I know of.—I recommended it to ministers to send for Dr. Willis's servants ; and I advised the Doctor to send for his son to assist him, because I thought the confinement more than he could submit to.

Whether you had, either to his Majesty's Ministers or to Dr. Willis, ever suggested a wish that Dr. John Willis should be called in to aid his Majesty's physicians in consultation ?

No.

Whether

Whether any notification from authority was ever made to you, that Dr. John Willis was to be considered in that light?

No.

Whether you have ever heard from any of your brethern, the King's physicians, that any notification to that effect had been made to them?

No.

Whether you explained, either to Dr. Willis the father, or to Dr. John Willis, that Dr. John Willis, was sent for as the director of Dr. Willis's other servants, and not in the same character as Dr. Willis himself, as a physician who had dedicated his attention particularly to that branch of medicine.

Dr. Willis's son was sent for merely at my own suggestion, as I apprehend, to assist his father, without my knowing that he had ever taken a degree.

When you understood that Dr. John Willis was a regular bred physician, did you then make the explanation as stated in the former question?

I do not recollect that I said any thing to him upon the subject.

Withdrew.

F I N I S.

328591

328591